

**The Ramakrishna Mission
Institute of Culture Library**

Presented by

Dr. Baridbaran Mukerji

RMICL—8

6

15555

THE MODERN WORLD.

BY
SHOSHEE CHUNDER DUTT.

“ What constitutes a State ?
Not high-raised battlement or laboured mound,
Thick wall or moated gate ;
Not cities proud with spires and turrets crowned ;
Not bays and broad-armed ports,
Where, laughing at the storm, rich navies ride ;
* * * * *
But Men, high-minded men ! ”

SIR WILLIAM JONES.

LONDON :
PRINTED BY
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, LIMITED.
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE, CLERKENWELL.
1884.
[All rights reserved.]

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS	5
II. GREAT BRITAIN	15
III. THE DEPENDENCIES OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE	53
IV. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	85
V. FRANCE ; OR, THE <i>GRANDE NATION</i>	113
VI. GERMANY	151
VII. RUSSIA	186
VIII. THE MINOR STATES OF EUROPE	228
IX. THE INDEPENDENT STATES OF ASIA, AFRICA, AND AMERICA	263
X. RÉSUMÉ	287
INDEX	313

THE MODERN WORLD.¹

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

THE best study of man is the future of mankind, and to qualify for that study it is necessary to know the history of the past. We have already spoken of the Ancient World; it is our purpose now to speak of the Modern World, so remarkable for its political changes and intellectual revolutions. To read it aright we must read the history of its growth; but that does not necessarily imply that we must burden ourselves with a multitude of facts, names, and dates, a dry collection of which will never be palatable to the general reader. The facts in detail are fully set forth in special histories, which are always accessible for reference. The aim we have in view is to present to the reader such a selection of items from them as will give a telescopic view of the world as we find it, explaining the phases it has passed through. In such an attempt it will be necessary, of course, to allude to the projecting or turning points of general history, and to the memorable

¹ The political state of the world has undergone many changes since this work was first published in 1876; but we have not so revised it as to include every change that has taken place.

events of all times and places which have contributed to the development of the nations that exist; but it will be necessary, at the same time, to shorten the pictures by abridgment, and to omit not only events and deeds of secondary importance, but also all the unnecessary adjuncts appertaining to deeds of primary magnitude. The multitude of facts to pick from is immense; but we must not get entangled among them. We want those particulars only that elucidate the dependence of the different countries on each other, and account for their present relative positions. The history of England is, or ought to be, familiar to all our readers, and no regular narration of events relating to it will therefore be attempted. But some cursory allusion to the principal events of other countries must be made, since the Indian reader generally is not very conversant with them.

The main points of our inquiry, it will be understood, are the progress of liberty and the diffusion of civilisation, which virtually comprise the history of modern times. Absolute freedom nowhere exists; it is an indefinite idea that does not admit of complete realisation. But every nation carries with it the principle or capacity of development, and the results compassed by such development are freedom, civilisation, and happiness, in greater or less degree. In the ancient world civilisation was well attained, but not freedom, till we come to the times of Greece and Rome. In the modern world, both civilisation and freedom have been better attained in all places, even where much of political liberty has not yet been acquired. The civilisation of the modern world is also of a higher standard than that which was attained in the past, the latter having been founded on universal abasement, while the former is established on universal advancement; but

genius, talent, and virtue were met with in as much abundance in the old world as they have yet been in the new. The knowledge of the modern world differs from that of the ancient world mainly in this, that it is more extensively diffused, man having made the earth his own now more fully than it ever was before. He has bridged over its seas and scaled its mountains; traversed its wildest and most arid plains; explored its remotest inlets and islands, even unto the poles. The knowledge of the ancients permeated only through the countries which were known to them—namely, the southern portions of Asia, the south-eastern countries of Europe, and the north-eastern corner of Africa. But now geography has mastered all the secrets of *Terra Incognita*, and the pushing civilisation of the age has made every part of the globe accessible by railways, bridges, and canals. The Suez Canal, the Thames Tunnel, the bridges over the Menai Straits and the St. Lawrence, are stupendous works which have been multiplied in minor dimensions in every direction. The lightning-post has traversed every part of Europe and the United States, and is rapidly crossing Australasia, India, and the extremities of the earth generally, all of which are being daily more closely connected with Europe. The network of railways has received almost equal expansion; and the result of these advances is, that the standard of humanity has been raised everywhere by the acceleration of intercourse between the different races inhabiting the earth, and by the relief of material want by the utilisation of the surplusage of one place for the benefit of another. It is a common saying, that all in Europe are now in the presence of each other; nor are America, India, and Australasia more distant on account of the seas that intervene between them. Within

an interval of twenty-two days the latest new novel published in London or Paris finds its way out into the hands of the Hindu reader on the banks of the Hooghly; and day by day the electric wire dolēs out the most important items of intelligence from all the great centres of civilisation to the outermost confines of the globe.

Taking the two divisions of the world, the old and the new, together, the course of progress is seen to have travelled from east to west—from Asia to Europe, and thence across the Atlantic to America. It has since diverged towards the south and south-east—to Africa, Australasia, and the islands in the Indian Ocean; while the West, originally a borrower, is repaying to the East her deep debt of gratitude by communicating to her all her recent discoveries and refinements. The footsteps of this development it will not be an unpleasant or unremunerative task to trace. The point to start from is the line of demarcation between the histories of the old world and the new, which is broadly defined by the migration of nations from Asia to Europe, by which the Roman world was upset, and of which the cause has not yet been correctly understood. The races in Europe previous to this era were the Celts, the Goths, and the Slavs; the first of whom inhabited Britain, France, a part of Spain, a part of Italy, and the Alps; the second, Germany and Scandinavia; the third, all the countries to the East. It is believed that the Goths migrated from Europe to Asia, but were brought back by the rushing hordes which a short time afterwards precipitated themselves westwards, and compelled all before them to reoccupy their own original quarters to escape being ridden over. The effects of this general hurricane were anarchy and confusion, followed by an intermixture of nations and the

establishment of new kingdoms, the first kingdom established being that of the Suevi and the Vandals in Spain, which was overturned by the Visigoths : the second, the kingdom of the Franks in Gaul ; the third, the kingdom of the Ostrogoths in Italy, which was subverted by the Lombards ; the fourth, the kingdom of the Burgundians, which lay between France and Germany ; and the fifth, the kingdom established by the Anglo-Saxons in Britain. Germany became the seat of the residuum of the barbarians, including the Goths ; while the Scandinavians, a section of the latter race originally established on the shores of the Baltic, spread themselves out, first, as Normans, into France and Britain, and generally all over Europe, and next, as Varangians, into Russia, where they founded the Russian Empire on the Slavonian stem. The immediate results of these changes were the Dark and the Middle Ages ; but their ulterior effects have made Europe to flourish anew, called forth the energies of new nations and countries, led to the discovery of new lands, and in the place of one Persia, one Greece, and one Rome, developed several nations, at one and the same time, almost to an equality of civilisation, power, and greatness. They have done even more than this, for they have destroyed the isolation of nations. All over the world, Englishmen, Germans, and Americans are now domiciled almost in every place ; and in Europe the different nationalities are constantly intermingling and verging to a fusion of blood and interests. At the same time, the products of the different countries are being freely interchanged, wildernesses are being converted into blooming gardens, mountains clothed with vegetation, climates and temperatures improved, and civilisation transferred from one extremity of the earth to another. The changes effected have

been already so considerable, that, while the greatest difficulty was experienced in the past by the boldest men of one country in visiting another without a strong retinue, European females now make the circuit of the globe by themselves, without needing any special protection. The Hindu, who could not cross the Indus or venture on the ocean before without loss of caste, is now constantly passing backwards and forwards from India to Great Britain; and English sportsmen conduct their hunting expeditions in the wilds of Africa and South America, or ramble for pleasure across the steppés of Central Asia.

This is one side of the picture—namely, the favourable side; but it is not the only phase we have to consider. If an extraordinary degree of similarity and closeness has been arrived at, absolute sameness, or anything near to it, has not been secured. Liberty has grown largely everywhere; but yet are not all countries equally free. The increased intercourse and connection of races have civilised them all round to a great extent; but still are not all races equally civilised. The civilisation of the American and the Russian is not quite on a par with the civilisation of the Englishman and the Frenchman; and the civilisation of the Magyar and the Turk is yet lower in degree. The diversities that yet exist are, in fact, as striking as the resemblances which have been attained. Each country has still a marked speciality to distinguish it from others, and this is observable even in those that are nearly akin. England and America, which ought to resemble most, are sundered alike by the Atlantic and the strong peculiarities and prejudices which distinguish them from each other. France and England are next-door neighbours, approaching nearest in civilisation and

refinement, but disunited more by their respective notions of liberty and their historic associations, than by the small channel that runs between them. Germany, Austria, and Russia are all despotic governments, but totally differing from each other in their despotism: the autocrats of Germany and Austria, for instance, can both, like the Czar, set large armies in motion by their orders, but they cannot, as he can, set their peoples also in motion. Whence do these diversities in the midst of so much resemblance arise? Civil and political liberty have been best attained in England and America, yet are not their governments similarly constituted. In a lower degree they have also been attained in Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, and Italy; but France, which has struggled for them most frantically, has not yet been able to secure them. In Germany the struggle for them has yet to come, and threatens more commotions in the future than any that has yet convulsed her. Russia will probably have to wait a hundred years more before she gets them. Turkey will have ceased to exist before the possibility of her securing them can arise. Why is this so? Why in the midst of so much outward resemblance are some nations free and prosperous, while others, their nearest neighbours, are unprosperous and in bonds?

This invites particular attention to the fact that even now nothing is more diverse than the genius of the different nations, notwithstanding their near resemblance in outward civilisation. We have said already that much progress has been lately made on all sides towards the attainment of liberty and refinement; but very different are the ways in which the same ends have been sought for, very different the appliances used in attaining them. Of course every nation has a time—and, if properly

trained, not one time only—to develop itself fully ; but, as liberty and greatness grow, and are not acquired, it depends mainly on the character of the people how their growth is directed, and whether that growth shall be stunted or luxuriant. In general acceptance the republican form of government is regarded as the most free ; and so it has been found in the United States, in Holland, and in Switzerland. But it does not equally suit the character of all nations, and in several places the monarchical form has been preferred, as being in all respects more convenient without being less free. England, the freest country in the world, is monarchical ; while Spain, the country of brigands and ruffians, was, for a short interval at least, a republic. All America, with the exception of Canada and Brazil, is republican ; but, barring the United States, the republics everywhere are based entirely on military force, and are necessarily subject to constant revolutions, and not in any sense free. No two constitutions anywhere are precisely alike ; nor do the teachings of the past inculcate that they should be so. The actions of men proceed from their need ; that need varies according to time and place, and still more according to the views entertained of it in different places : the actions necessarily are different, and the results dissimilar. The need, moreover, is often, very often, misinterpreted and misdirected by passions and private aims, to which the greatness of nations, the wisdom of States, and the well-being of administrations are unhesitatingly and unscrupulously sacrificed. Few, very few, are the States in which passions and private aims cannot thus be gratified at the expense of the general weal. Such being the diversities that influence mankind, it is not strange that the results are so dissimilar.

Nor does the contest for greatness and liberty suit all States, at least at all times ; and it is certain that nations are not necessarily wretched because they happen to be less great or less free. As in individual, so in national life, a limited sphere of action seems often to afford a greater degree of well-being, if not of happiness, than the most unbounded freedom. A shepherd or a peasant is not less happy than a prime-minister or a prince ; and intrinsically the Swedes and the Danes are not less well-off than the English or the French. It is the necessary fate of Asiatic nations to be subject to the domination of Europeans ; and India is held by the English, and all Siberia by the Russians. Their dependence doubtless is to them a political misfortune, but they are really happier in it than they ever were in their freedom. If they could be both happy and free, which would be the case if they were also powerful, that would doubtless be the best state for them. But under existing circumstances they are not unhappy ; and, in the case of Egypt, it is doubtful if she is not happier than the sovereign State. The development of nations requires a perpetual change of position, but for States in the condition of Siberia and India a course of dependence, when it secures rest and peace, is apparently better suited. Even progress itself has to pursue its onward path most frequently through convulsions ; but, for progress to be so attained, all countries are not equally qualified. That qualification must be acquired ; and it can only be acquired by a preparative course of rest, which is therefore not dear even when it is purchased by subjection.

States of the above description, however, will require little attention in our present inquiry, which will mainly embrace those of Europe, which are all more or less free.

America in such a review stands but as an offshoot of Europe, and will be noticed only as such. The old races in it, treated with violence, have nearly died out, except in South America, where the Spaniards and the Portuguese intermixed with them and raised up a spurious breed. This distinction deserves to be remembered. The whole of North America, with the exception of Mexico and the States to the south of it, has been colonised by immigrants from Europe, and the native Americans extirpated; the whole of South America, and Mexico in North America, were conquered, but the native races—though treated with unusual atrocity—were not exterminated. Regarding Africa there is little to mention, as it scarcely forms a historical part of the world yet, having no movement or development to exhibit except in the coast-land on the north, the history of which belongs to the histories of Europe and Asia. Of Asia, also, the account to be given must necessarily be slender, as the destiny of this continent in the modern world is generally that of subjection to Europe, which Russia, at least, is working out with untiring pertinacity. The independent States in Asia are the effete ones of the ancient world, to which a very cursory allusion only need be made. Of all countries the general spirit and political formation merely will be noticed, and those events which have created an epoch or changed the aspect and aspirations of the people.

CHAPTER II.

GREAT BRITAIN.

GREAT BRITAIN occupies a very insignificant position in the map of the world, but there is no part of that map to which her dominion does not extend. Let the reader spread out before him the chart of the two hemispheres and run his eye over all the strategical points therein, and he will find that almost all of them are held by the "Mistress of the Seas." They have been won for her by her soldiers and sailors in the quietest manner possible, and virtually secure to her an almost universal dominion, which places her foremost in the scale of empires. With this material superiority she has also secured a moral pre-eminence of a yet higher character. Her institutions are generally held to be the best in the world, her government the least faulty; and thus well-balanced at home and abroad, she retains a steadfast position, unaffected by political storms either from without or within. True liberty, which is bragged of everywhere, is domiciled only within the seas which gird the British Isles. Dethroned princes, runaway potentates, persecuted ministers and patriots, exiles of every description, flock to them from all parts of the world, for that security and peace which other countries boast of, but are unable to afford.

The history of such a country could not but be instructive, and perhaps the history of no other country has

been better read. One great truth established by it is, that the growth of excellence is slow, and systematical even from the outset. Those who choose to do so, may also trace in it the hand of Providence regulating the advance at every stage. If the Jews in ancient times were a peculiarly favoured people, so in modern times have been the English; though that favour has been manifested, as is usual with the dispensations of Providence, in the midst of storms and convulsions, which purified* the atmosphere of their island-home. We cannot stop to notice the history of this progress step by step as it was developed; it will be enough for our purpose to indicate the more important landmarks by which it is to be traced.

The fabulous history of Britain begins with the colonisation of the island by Bruto, or Brute, the grandson of Æneas, who is said to have been succeeded by a long line of descendants. Of these, however, we have no historic knowledge. The first known inhabitants of the island were the Celts, who were seen in it by the Phœnicians when they came to it for tin. These aborigines are generally set down as having been very barbarous, but erroneously, since we find that they were collected in political communities under the government of a king, had a national religion, and were possessed of some knowledge of philosophy, astronomy, and medicine. They are represented on all hands as having been very brave, and as having given the Romans a warm reception on their first invasion of Britain, which so astonished the legions of Cæsar, that, contrary to their usual behaviour, they betrayed a dislike to continue the fight. It was only when Mandubratius, a traitor, fled over subsequently to Gaul, and thereby created a division among the Britons,

that the arts, not valour, of Cæsar prevailed; but there is no doubt that at the outset Cæsar was fairly beaten, since Suetonius, himself a Roman general, admits that it was so. Nor were the Celts of England finally conquered till one hundred and forty years after, by Agricola, in the reign of Domitian; while the Celts of Scotland—the Picts and Scots—were never subdued.

The history of this period, however, is not the history of the English people, who were of later growth. The decline of the Roman Empire compelled the Romans to abandon Britain after a sway of about four hundred and seventy years. The Picts and Scots, who had always been troublesome to their southern neighbours, molested them now to such an extent that Vortigern was obliged to apply to the Saxons for aid. The assistance asked for was given; the Picts and Scots were defeated: but the Saxons throve so well in the land they had come to, that, far from retiring from it, they began to invite over fresh hordes from the forests of Germany, which finally enabled them to establish their dominion from the Thames to the Tamar, and compelled the Britons to retire into Wales.

England derives her name from Anglen, a district of Holstein, the home of the Angles, a fierce people, the traces of whose character may yet be observed in that of the English of the present day. There were three German tribes that came over to the island almost simultaneously—namely, the Angles and the Jutes from the south of Denmark, and the Saxons from the north of Germany. All these were afterwards classified under the general name of Anglo-Saxons. They were all brave and hardy, and had been noted from the earliest times for their piracies at sea, and for the havoc they frequently made on the coasts of Britain and France; but it nevertheless

took them one hundred and fifty years to establish their authority completely in Britain, during the whole of which period they were obliged to keep up a perpetual warfare with the Celts. It is in connection with these disturbances that the fables regarding Arthur and his knights are told.

After the conquest of the country, the different Saxon hordes divided it into seven distinct principalities, each setting up a ruler of its own; and this division was called the Heptarchy, the kings of which only nominally acknowledged one of their number as their *Brœtwalda*, or chief. This arrangement remained in force for upwards of two hundred years, after which Egbert, King of Wessex, united the different States into one monarchy. The other great sovereigns of the race were Alfred, Athelstane, Edgar, and Harold. The whole of the Saxon era was one of great unrest. In the reign of Egbert began the invasions of the Danes, a nation of pirates who committed dreadful ravages on the coast of Britain; and at about the same time the Northmen, or Normans, another horde from the same hive, infested the north-west coast of France, where they eventually settled. The Danes received a temporary check from the tact and vigour of Alfred, who obliged them to either leave the country or acknowledge his supremacy, which led to their settlement in Mercia and East Anglia. Their insolence culminated in the invasion of England by Sweyn, in A.D. 1013, and the succession of his son, Canute, to the throne. Canute was succeeded by two other Danish princes, after whom the Saxon line was restored, in 1041, by the succession of Edward the Confessor. Harold succeeded Edward, but with no valid title to the crown, which was, within a very short time after, wrenched from him by William of Normandy.

The Normans wrested the possession of the country

from the Saxons; but the Normans were not Franks, nor the Saxons, or Anglo-Saxons, identical with the English nation as it was afterwards developed. Hume says that, by the time of William, the Normans had thoroughly mingled with the Franks. This they had doubtless done, as well by intermarriage as by the adoption of the language, religion, and usages of the Franks; but, nevertheless, the invaders of England were not French, nor even of mixed descent. Macaulay, in his usual dogmatical manner, speaks of the *French* kings of England; but they were no more French than Huns: they were Scandinavians born on French soil. The remarks of Schlegel on the point are very pertinent. He correctly observes that, though the Normans adopted the French language, "in mind and manners they retained their individuality throughout the whole of the Middle Ages; so that at that time the Normans and the French, even when speaking the same language, must by no means be regarded as one, but as two very distinct nations." The English, again, are a mixed race, derived from the fusion of the Celts, Anglo-Saxons, Danes, and Normans. The *bonâ fide* English nation was therefore not in existence when the battle of Hastings was fought. All that can be conceded to without demur comes therefore to this, that the people who inhabited the north-west coast of France defeated the people who inhabited England in 1066; but whether that implies the glorification of the French nation at the expense of the English is a very different question.

The conquest made by the Normans was not an easy one, and but for adventitious circumstances would perhaps never have been achieved. The invaders crossed an undefended sea, to land on an undefended shore, Harold having

been obliged to withdraw both his army and his navy from the southern coast to repel an invasion in the north made by Hadrada, king of Norway. When, after having defeated one enemy, he came back to repel the other, his army was numerically so inferior to that of the invaders, that his best captains advised him to fall back upon London, and, by laying waste the country about it, starve the Normans, also giving time thereby to the Saxon fleet to reassemble and intercept communication with Normandy. But Harold's blood was up, and his kindly heart rejected the idea of laying any part of the country waste: and it was for these reasons that the battle of Hastings was lost.

Conquest to a brave people is a bitter draught. The sense of foreign domination weighed heavily on the Saxons, and the violence of the Normans magnified its severity. The consequence was that fierce local risings were constant, and were followed by revengeful cruelties on the part of the conquerors. William himself followed a remorseless policy, the object held in view by him being the annihilation of the Saxons as a distinct race. His efforts to crush them out were, however, unsuccessful; they only kept up bitter feuds and jealousies between the two parties in the State.

Notwithstanding all this, however, the Norman Conquest was not without its advantages. Previous to it England had no recognised position in Europe. The Romans had ruled as conquerors, keeping themselves distinct from the people they conquered, whom they compensated by protection and by instruction in their laws and institutions—somewhat in the way in which the English are now civilising their subject races in India. The Saxons, who came after them, mixed with the Celts freely, but were at best half-savages themselves; and

almost throughout the whole period of their ascendancy there was nothing but strife, waste, and turbulence. Compared with these periods the era of the Normans does not suffer. In it the conquerors ruled indeed with a rod of iron, trampled rough-shod over the feelings of the races they had conquered, and tried by every means in their power to root them out at least from a political existence. But they brought with them a civilisation superior to that of the Saxons; they had derived from the Franks a better cultivated language; and they had also acquired from that nation a knowledge of useful and tasteful arts. They were not very anxious, it is true, to advance the condition of the people they had conquered; but, having assumed the sovereignty of the country for good, they, for their own advantage, began to improve and beautify it, by better cultivation, and by the erection of permanent works of usefulness, and embellishment; while, for securing a better hold on the land, they introduced their own language, or rather Norman-French, as the language of government, of the law courts, and of the upper classes generally, which, if it caused a confusion of languages at first, was beneficial in the end in this way, that it made the refinements of the Franks accessible at least to people of the higher classes in Britain.

The Saxons were a barbarous people, in some respects even more barbarous than the Celts they had conquered. But they introduced popular institutions, and brought with them those notions of equal rights which they held in common with all the German nations. This was the indelible mark they left on the land. The constitution of the Wittenagemot is not exactly known. It may be admitted that it was not a representative body, but it was assuredly the nearest approach to representation that

could have been expected in that age. It was an assembly of thanes who held lands immediately of the Crown, and who could command the services of their military vassals. These thanes elected the king, and their assent was also necessary to give effect to all legislative enactments, since, except with their acquiescence and support, the kings had no hold whatever on the people. It is said that similar assemblies existed even among the Britons, which were called *Fahring brat*, or *Comblach*. But the Saxon Wittenagemot was at least a better recognised institution, with greater powers. Under the Normans the form was continued, the assemblies assuming the Latin title of *Concilium*, or *Curia*; but their powers were very much curtailed. The parliamentary form of government in England was therefore coeval with political government, though, of course, the institution was not at all times equally free. Under the Saxons the thanes often exercised immeasurable power,—as was the case with Godwin, Harold, and Siward; but the commons were not ignored. The rule of the Normans was more despotic; the commons were nowhere, and even the barons exercised such power only as they were able to usurp.

At the close of the first five hundred years of her existence the progress of England was confined to the impressions left on her by her Roman masters; in the next five hundred years were engrafted on them the free institutions of the Anglo-Saxons. In the succeeding five hundred years she passed through the semi-barbarism of Norman domination, at the end of which she reached the confines of civilisation. But the impress of the Normans was not the less necessary to form the national character. The feudal system in its mature state was introduced by

the Normans. By it the lands were partly retained by the Crown, and partly divided among the great military leaders on the condition of their attending on the king in his wars. This change was apparently a retrograde one; it introduced a new race of paramount landlords by dispossessing the former owners of the soil; the possessions of an entire community were sequestered, and the peasantry disposed of as villeins and serfs, going with the estate on which they were settled; a large number of petty tyrants were formally established, who virtually exercised sovereign power within their estates under the general control of the king. But, on the other hand, it also inaugurated order, property, and civil subordination, and consolidated a number of petty, antagonistic States into one powerful kingdom, having one recognised head, one law, one language, and one supreme legislature. The spirit of popular liberty had been previously derived from the Saxons; the framework of polity had been borrowed from the Romans: it was left to the Normans to convert a federal community into an integral kingdom, and to consolidate it by insuring social subordination and proprietary security; both which advantages were by the feudal system fully attained.

The Norman reign lasted for four hundred and twenty years. At the outset the monarchs were absolute, having nothing to fear except the greatness of their own vassals—the iron barons they had called forth—who met in council when summoned by the king to give their advice and consent on matters which were laid before them, but who did not at this stage exercise any direct control over him. The weakness and tyranny of one of the sovereigns, John, changed this state of affairs. The barons, driven to rebellion, extorted from him great concessions, which

were embodied in what was called the *Magna Charta*, as distinguished from other minor charters previously granted by his predecessors, which conceded particular privileges to some of the greater vassals and churchmen of the State. The charter now obtained secured for the first time all orders of the people in their rights and privileges; the monarchy of the country was declared by it to be limited; and it was expressly provided that no taxes were to be levied from the people, except in a few special cases, without the consent of the general council of the barons and the clergy, that all cities and boroughs were to be allowed to preserve their ancient liberties, that no person was to be tried on suspicion alone, and that no person was to be tried or punished except by the legal judgment of his peers, or by the laws of the land. This, which was regarded at the time as a shameful violation of the royal prerogative, and which drew down upon it the thunders of the Vatican, has been since justly considered as the first chapter of the English constitution and the palladium of English liberty; nay, as the first broken rivet of human emancipation. The rate of progress in Britain was greatly accelerated by it. A considerable interval elapsed before the rights it conceded were fully established; but they were all established in due course. In the reign that immediately followed, the barons rose up again, and, undertaking the task of reforming the constitution thoroughly, subverted the exclusive domination of the Crown and the chief nobles by introducing the principle of popular representation, which was practically exemplified by calling together the first Parliament, in which each city and borough was represented.

The Norman chiefs who obtained possession of England by conquest, also held territories in France under the

vassalage of the French crown, the regal possession of Normandy having been surrendered in the reign of John, excepting that of the Norman isles—Jersey, Guernsey, and Alderney—which is held by England to this day. This gave poignancy to the fierce and protracted struggle for the phantom crown of France, which was commenced by Edward III., who based his claim in right of his mother, a princess of France. The contest was diversified by the splendid victories gained by the English at Cressy, Poitiers, Verneuil, and Agincourt; but it eventually ended in their entire expulsion from France, which was regarded by both the contending parties as an ignominious reverse for England, though it proved really to be an important gain to her by thenceforth concentrating all her energies to the development of her greatness, while, had the two crowns been united, England would probably never have had an independent existence. The fruits of the reverse were, however, not immediately reaped. Without any external enemy to fight with, the English barons began to quarrel among themselves, and, Edward III. having left several sons, a contest for the sovereign power between two of the royal branches divided the nobility and the people into two distinct parties, which carried on a sanguinary strife for upwards of thirty years, that was only terminated by the accession of Henry VII. to the throne. The results of these struggles were the almost entire annihilation of the power of the barons, and the extinction of villeinage, which liberated the aspirations of the people and enabled them to move forward and assume their proper place in the commonwealth.

The pacific era of the Tudors was very favourable to the growth of public prosperity. The elevation of the commons and the increase of authority of the king

were both caused by the decline of the feudal and ecclesiastical orders, the latter of which was exhausted by its arrogance, at the same time that the former was annihilated by self-destructive feuds. The Tudor age is generally regarded as a very despotic one, and doubtless was so; but that despotism was prejudicial only to the interests of the upper classes, not to those of the people. The reign of Henry VII. terminated the period called the "Middle Ages," and ushered the world at large to greater light and freedom. In England, the reign of Elizabeth was particularly distinguished. In the Plantagenet period, it was the sword that had arbitrated on all doubtful occasions between the upper and the productive classes; at the commencement of the Protestant Reformation, persecution and the fagot assumed the place of arms: but a better era was inaugurated by the Reformation after it was accomplished, as it smoothed the way for further reforms by affording greater-freedom to thought and discussion, and called forth the middle and productive classes into prominence. The wise and vigorous administration of Elizabeth gave scope and impulse to these movements by opening out new careers and new fields of enterprise to her subjects. A great impulse was given to mercantile adventures by the extraordinary geographical discoveries of the age. The exploits of Drake, Cavendish, Raleigh, Frobisher, and others, led to the establishment of colonies and factories, and the opening out of new branches of commerce in distant and hitherto unknown lands. Commerce, which had till now been regarded with disdain by the generality of country-gentlemen, and even by younger sons, who preferred to it a life of penury and dependence, became henceforth the rage, and was pursued by almost all

classes with equal alacrity. This broke up the immense fortunes of the upper classes, which had, in previous eras, rendered them formidable alike to the king and the people; it also made the people richer, and necessarily more ambitious. The arms of the queen were, at the same time, victorious in distant lands, and, Providence having destroyed the Spanish Armada on the English coast, the prestige of the English nation was strongly established, and, from a second-rate position, England assumed from this time the rank and status of a first-rate power. The era was also pre-eminently marked by the emancipation of letters. The touch of Prospero's wand England received from Shakspeare and Spenser; Raleigh was her first historian; and, in the following reign, Bacon emancipated philosophy from the fetters which had encumbered her.

The Stuart era that followed was not half so vigorous; and, if it was characterised by the absence of external disturbances, that was mainly owing to the incidental advantage gained by the accession of James I., which not only settled the right of succession, but united together two distinct countries, which had been perpetually fighting with each other from the earliest dawn of their existence. The popular spirit, however, which had been gaining force during the Tudor period, now began to develop itself—inconveniently for the theory of the divine right of kings; and, in the reign of Charles I., the Crown and the Commons found themselves in direct opposition to each other, and battled for their rights: those of the latter being vindicated by the success of the “Great Rebellion,” and finally guaranteed and made living by the Revolution of 1688. The results of the civil war were not at once very decisive. The reign of Charles was

overthrown, and the king beheaded ; but the supremacy of the Commons was not abiding : and, the military despotism of Cromwell being soon found to be more intolerable than the misrule of kings, royalty, in the person of Charles II., was replaced on the throne. But the disturbances were so far salutary in their consequences that they laid the foundation of England's power, infused energy and enterprise through every class of her population, promoted inquiry, and led, in the next generation, to the royal authority being curtailed for good, and defined. In the reign of Charles II., the Habeas Corpus Act, which protects the subjects from illegal imprisonment, was passed ; and the reign of James II. closed with the Bill of Rights, which enumerated the various laws by which the royal prerogative and popular liberties were defined and settled, the same being ratified by William and Mary on their being raised to the throne.

The corruptions of the Stuart period were atrocious ; and manners were then more openly licentious and depraved than they had ever been, even during the Middle Ages. The vice of concubinage was common, and a mistress made part of the customary appendage of every great family—the principal cause of which was the low moral and intellectual standard of the age. In mathematics, physical science, and metaphysics, considerable advances had been made—Locke, Newton, and Boyle having cleared the way ; but the more accessible literature of common life—that which purifies the heart and elevates manners—had barely commenced to revive. Milton, the second great poet of Britain, shed lustre over the era of the Commonwealth ; but his was an isolated star, of surpassing purity indeed, but which only lighted the mass of impurity around it, without being able to dissipate

its intenseness: nor was the atmosphere thoroughly purged till the reign of Anne—the age of Addison, Bolingbroke, and Pope—with which the Stuart period was closed. The reign of Anne was also celebrated for the great military triumphs of Marlborough over the French at Blenheim, Ramillies, and Oudenarde, by which Louis XIV. was humiliated and his power considerably reduced; and for the chivalrous bravery of the Earl of Peterborough in Spain. But what it will be best remembered for is the formal union of England and Scotland, which was then carried out by the abolition of the separate government and separate Parliament of Scotland, and by the adoption of the consolidated title of Great Britain, from 1707.

All the civil, religious, and political institutions of England were completed during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which were followed by the rule of the House of Brunswick. Since then, in less than two hundred years, England has attained, with the greatest rapidity, her present high position in the world, and acquired an empire that environs the globe. The commencement of the Hanoverian rule was not particularly distinguished. In morals it was worse even than the worst portion of the Stuart period, and it is recorded of George I. that he brought with him from Germany a whole seraglio of faded mistresses. The peace of the country was also disturbed by the various attempts made to restore the Stuart family to the throne, both by their friends in England and Scotland, and by the sovereigns of France and Spain. No sooner were these attempts put down than the English nation found themselves, in the reign of George III., engaged in a protracted war with France—a war that called forth all the energies of

Britain, and made her great almost in spite of herself. The national character had taken a long time—no less than seventeen hundred years—to mature; but it was now fully developed, and quite equal to the crisis. The result was a great accession of power and territories both in America and in the East Indies. A temporary reverse followed when, in 1775, the United States of America resisted the claims of the parent-country to tax them. These States had been created mainly by the colonisation of English inhabitants. By their first formation the parent-country was much relieved, as they served as an outlet for her political and religious discontents, and opened to her enterprising classes a new and boundless field of industry. Their rupture with the mother-country on a later day was the inevitable result of overgrowth. Britain, like mother-states in general, was naturally anxious to preserve her supremacy over them; but the condition of pupillage was disowned, and her rule violently overthrown. France and Spain took advantage of England's difficulty to avenge their old defeats, and humiliate the Mistress of the Seas; and, in 1779, their combined fleets, sailing up the Channel, defied England, and threatened Plymouth. All this was repaid with interest on a later day; but England was compelled to acknowledge the independence of the United States in 1783,—at which period, besides the nations openly arrayed against her, Russia, Sweden, and Denmark formed themselves into an armed neutrality that was hostile to her.

But those who had expected that the English people would be crippled, as well as humiliated, by their reverses, were disappointed. The prosperous career of England was continued, and many advantages were gained by her during the short respite from wars that followed. From

the conclusion of peace with the Americans there was nothing to disturb her until the outbreak of the great war in 1793, when the French, after having deposed and murdered their king, came back to renew their old struggles with her. Hostilities were now continued for several years, and England was for some time in constant dread of French invasions, till Pitt roused the nation from their pusillanimous torpidity. Then followed the development of the genius of Howe, Jervis, Collingwood, and Nelson, and the crowning triumph of Trafalgar; then the restoration of peace; and then, again, the resumption of hostilities, till the island hornets were fairly aroused and stung the French to madness at Waterloo. The gain to England from these hostilities was great, as all the French possessions in the East and West Indies were now finally taken, which made ample amends for the loss of the United States. Nor would England be a loser if these again were ever lost. Her greatness is in the spirit of the nation, which easily diverts its activity from one sphere of action to another, and repairs loss in one quarter by gain in another.

The difficulties of England have always been Ireland's opportunity, and, during the war with France, a rebellion broke out in that island and raged with great violence. The original conquest of Ireland was accomplished in the reign of Henry II., since which time she has always preserved the character of a surly dog snapping at his master's chain. By the time of the Tudors the best portions of the island had to be reconquered, the conquest being completed towards the end of Elizabeth's reign; so that virtually James I. was the first king who ruled over the united kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland. But at this time Ireland was ruled rather as a

dependency, and not, like Scotland, on terms of equality ; and it was only natural that she should remain unreconciled to her lot. Concessions after concessions were made to her afterwards ; but, as the Irish were the descendants of the Celts, and by far the greater portion of them Catholics, the advances for fusion made to them by Protestants descended from the Anglo-Saxons and Normans were, for the most part, received with repugnance, and rejected. The rebellion in Ireland was suppressed after much bloodshed ; and, the English being determined to amalgamate her with England, an incorporating union, as with Scotland, was effected from the commencement of 1801. This arrangement was, upon the whole, carried out with great fairness ; but it did not allay the discontent of the Irish. A new insurrection broke out among them in 1803 ; and ever since Ireland has remained as an open sore by the side of Britain, the only source of her weakness in Europe.

The reign of George III. was an illustrious one, but not simply for the triumphs which graced the British arms. Throughout the country the condition of all classes was ameliorated—their clothing, lodging, furniture, and diet improved. To these succeeded moral improvements, decline of intemperance, cessation of tavern indulgences, disappearance of foot-pads, etc. It was also the age of humanity, when institutions of charity and benevolence were multiplied, cruel and nefarious punishments abolished, and efforts made to better the state of the poor ; and when that crowning act of mercy, the abolition of the slave-trade, was carried out.

The victory of Waterloo was succeeded by the longest peace on record ; and peace has always proved to be England's greatest ally in securing both material im-

provement and improvements in mind, freedom, justice, and charity. The reigns of George IV. and William IV. were eminently progressive, the latter being particularly distinguished by the political enfranchisement of the people, and the removal of obstructive municipal and commercial monopolies. The reign of Victoria has similarly been signalised by expansion in every direction, and by an equalisation of benefits among all classes, and a multiplication of the conveniences and enjoyments of social existence. In literature, the period of the Georges produced the best of British historians—Hume, Gibbon, and Robertson; the intellectual development in other departments being sustained by a brilliant galaxy of other writers, with Johnson at their head, whose era was extended to still later days. Since then the country has become more thoroughly utilitarian even in letters, and the rage for poems and dramas has been dying out. We do not know what would be the fate of a new “Hamlet” or “Othello” at this moment; we are certain that a new “Paradise Lost” would not be endured: and, if Tennyson is tolerated, it is only because he is accepted as the last of a race that will not be perpetuated. Practical writing is now particularly valued; and novels also are much read.

The greatness achieved by England has thus been very slowly and gradually developed. It is the law of nature that all that is valuable and permanent in character should be the result, not of natural aspiration or of accidental success, but of trial and suffering, disappointment and defeat. Her constitution, which is the envy and wonder of all nations, took more than nine hundred years, from the days of the Saxons, to grow. The expulsion of the Stuarts gave it its finishing stroke; and

it has since then consisted of a hereditary monarchy, balanced on the one side by a house of peers, and on the other by a council of the people, all based on a Bill of Rights carefully defining the prerogatives and privileges of the different parties tethered together. This combination as it stands could not have been formed except by a process extending over several ages. Other nations in endeavouring to arrive at the same result more quickly, have only engulfed themselves in mischief and confusion. All Europe has since essayed the parliamentary system in imitation of England; but England alone has escaped both autocracy and anarchy, to one or other of which, if not to both, most of the other nations have fallen victims. In the English constitution no one is all-powerful—not the king, nor the lords, nor the people, nay, not even the law. Oppression when imposed by law or exercised by power has always something to check it, if it be but an unwritten custom, a remembrance, or a prejudice.

The monarchy of England is, for all executive purposes, as powerful as it need be—almost as strong, in fact, as despotism itself; but so limited in other respects that, were it thoroughly understood, it would fully satisfy the passionate ambition of those who seek in government for absolute equality. Under it the people enjoy an unbounded but unabused liberty; while the country is more prosperous than any in the world, without having had to sacrifice any rights or liberties to attain that prosperity. With all its jobberies of election, etc., the Parliament is, what it was intended to be, the great council of a great nation, where every passion and every prejudice is represented, together with the remedial opposition of great manliness, intelligence, and independence. All the real wishes and wants of the country are thus fairly brought

together, and at the same time properly preponderated and reconciled. Amidst the most clamorous opposition in Parliament and from the Press, and in the face of mob-meetings and reform petitions, the Government works smoothly, backed by all the resources of liberty and liberal institutions. Everything done is done under the fullest expansion of light and noise. Nothing escapes the universal law of publicity—a publicity very different from what is understood to be such in other countries. It is neither imposed, nor guaranteed, nor restrained, by law. It emanates from the public spirit of the nation, and is as ample as that spirit itself. Very often the liberty of the press is violated; but that does no harm. The public reserves to itself the right of deciding in every case, and special pleading on one side or the other is perfectly innocuous. What is England's business is the private business of every man in the country, and the hands of the Government are strengthened, not weakened, by discussions, whether favourable or otherwise. No amount of criticism, no amount of abuse even, can impair the vigour and resolution of a people determined to weigh all the *pros* and *cons* of a question and judge of it for themselves. It is not an ideal grievance or an ideal advantage that thus engrosses attention, but the everyday occurrences of busy life. It has always been so since England has been free; and, if it were not so, the Englishman would pull down his constitution about his own ears. His house, he knows, is not made of glass; and so he is not afraid to pelt stones at it, but rather takes a pleasure in doing so, to assure himself that what he takes so much pride in is really as substantial as he believes it to be.

After the king rank the peers, and this is so in almost

all countries. But the peerage in England is a very different institution from what it is elsewhere. It draws to itself all the great notabilities of the nation—in law, in arms, in diplomacy, in finance—without any regard to their origin, at the same time that it sends back to the mass of the people all its collateral branches, which fall in with the general ranks of society without title or distinction. The law of primogeniture was introduced in the feudal times. It is unjust in principle, and therefore indefensible. But it regulates both the constitution and society of England remarkably well, by throwing over the younger sons of peers into the common herd, with whom they are trained, and with whom they struggle energetically to recover the position from which they were thrust out. In the days of Norman supremacy the upper classes were not so easy of access from below, as the barons did not permit any encroachments on the distinctions which belonged exclusively to themselves. But the nation has since become thoroughly practical; the spinning-jenny and the steam-engine have brought down the nobility from their high elevation, or rather raised others to an equality, or near to an equality, with them. To every man who possesses talent and energy, whatever his origin, whatever his opinions, access to distinction and power is open; and, a great part of their body being thus drawn from the people, the aristocracy have no interests apart from those of the people, to whom they are faithful and by whom they are prized.

Besides the aristocracy there is a class of country-gentlemen in England, who spontaneously and gratuitously perform a great portion of the public duties elsewhere performed by paid officials—acting as sheriffs, justices of the peace, grand-jurors, commissioners of roads, etc.—

and who exhibit in their position and habits all the example of a real aristocracy; and, as the distinctions between these and the gentry at large are but indefinite, virtually all the classes are linked together and freely mix and commingle. There is no broad line of demarcation even to separate those in power from those who are not in power, as the boundary is being constantly crossed and recrossed. It is said of Napoleon I. that, while ruminating on his own career in St. Helena, he exclaimed: "Now we shall see what Wellington will do!" He was quite unable to understand that it was possible for an English gentleman, after having gained such triumph as was obtained at Waterloo, to stop in his onward career and resume his former position in life. It is from the bosom of rural life that in the hour of need all the great men of England are drawn; and, when their work is finished, they return again to their former place quietly, crowned possibly with honours and preferment—oftener not. The eminent importance of this individual moderation to national aggrandisement was well understood in ancient Greece and Rome, but in the modern world it is understood nowhere except in America and England.

The elevation of the people in England began with her agricultural, industrial, and commercial prosperity. The story of her agricultural development is diversified. The early agriculture of England was rude, till the Romans, who took a delight in the art, improved it. From the Saxons no improvement proceeded; in peaceful arts they were inferior to the Celts they conquered. The Normans understood the subject better, but the domestic feuds of the barons prevented them from doing much, and all that was achieved during their time was done only by the ecclesiastics, who cultivated their ample domains with

great knowledge and skill, improved the breed of cattle, and introduced better drainage wherever it was needed. The neglect of their estates by the lay lords was wicked : the rage for sheep-farming for wool to supply the manufactories of the Low Countries made matters worse ; and it was not till those manufactories were ruined by religious persecution that the English farmer returned earnestly to the plough. The progress of commerce under the Tudors and the Stuarts, and the construction of roads and highways that kept pace with it, gave agricultural development its greatest impetus ; and by the reign of Anne the whole interior of the country was full of farms. At the present moment the total cultivated area in England and Wales is set down at about thirty-four million acres, and the total uncultivated area at about six million acres—including the acreage occupied by houses and gardens in towns and villages, and by railroads, highways, rivers, and canals. The amount of land remaining to be reclaimed is necessarily very inconsiderable. All efforts at improvement are, therefore, now confined to scientific farming and the investment of capital, which attempt to make the area already under cultivation as productive as practicable. The lot of agricultural labourers in the country is, as everywhere else, the lowest, the workpeople of cities and towns being as a rule more prosperous. But this is true only of the class of labourers who have no lands of their own to farm. An English farmer, it is well known, is the most respectable specimen of his class in the world, and is better circumstanced not only than English workpeople in general, but even than many people of the higher classes—civil, professional, and mercantile.

The development of manufactures in the country has been still more successful. At this moment England furnishes clothing and household conveniences not only

to all her own dependencies, but to a very large portion of the world; and yet for a long time past almost all foreign countries were superior to her in this respect. So obtuse was the policy of England at the outset that she actually persecuted foreigners who came over to teach her what she did not understand, and it was not till this policy was altered that any improvement was made. The manufacture of wool was the first to be introduced, and dates from the time when the Flemings came over and brought the art with them. The manufacture of silk was introduced by the French in the fourteenth century. Linen came much later on the field, as even up to 1688 the finer descriptions of it were obtained from Germany. But England made up manfully for lost time. Her foreign teachers from being first tyrannised over were afterwards encouraged, sheltered, and imitated; and, by steadily pursuing this policy, she succeeded in time in attaining the foremost place, which she retains. The chief causes of her success were the industry and probity of her children, and, in a lower degree, the invention of improved machinery by them for increasing and cheapening the products of labour. The genius of Watts, Hargreaves, and Arkwright gave an impetus to the native partiality for hard work, and soon enabled their country to outstrip all competition. In all sorts of woollen and cotton manufacture, in leather goods, in hardware manufacture, earthenware, china, and glass, England holds the first place at this moment. The poetry of the subject is also best understood by her. The World's Fair, or Great Exhibition, was an English idea for recording the triumph of industrial enterprises, which has been adopted by all nations since; and no country need be ashamed of following England's lead in this respect at least.

The story of English commerce is a long one to tell, to which we could not do justice within such short compass as is available to us. The native riches of England gave her a mercantile character even from the days of the Phœnicians, who traded with her in tin; and to the Normans she was known as an *El Dorado* abounding in precious articles more than Normandy. But there was no signal development of her peculiar aptitude for traffic previous to the time of Elizabeth. The administrators of the Virgin reign, so pre-eminently illustrious in all respects, particularly understood the interests of buyers and sellers, and took the greatest care to disentangle the nation from all commercial treaties and alliances with other nations which were found to be embarrassing, the relief from which gave to their country her first fair start in the mart of the world. Unfortunately, in that age the monopoly system was the rage in all places, and continued to be so up to the time of the Georges, which accounts for commerce continuing to be tied down, to a considerable extent, to the latter era. The first efforts to liberate her from these shackles also emanated from England, commencing with the repeal of the Navigation Laws, by which the carrying-trade of the country had been confined to British-built ships owned and navigated by British subjects—an exclusiveness which was of course adopted by other countries, and led to a cessation of healthy competition. The next step taken in the same direction was the abolition of all protective duties, which rendered trade free. Both these concessions have since been widely reciprocated; but, had it not been so, the gain from them to England would still have been immense, as the best part of the world's traffic had intermediately passed into her hands. As it is, the actual result is an unprecedented

success. In riches England has never been equalled in any age by any country of not larger area and population; while, at this moment, she is absolutely the richest country in the world, almost without reference either to size or population. The revenue derived by her hereditary landowners is very considerable; but what is yet more abundant, is the tribute collected from all parts of the world by her princely merchants and money-dealers. As Taine remarks, "Enormous is the word that always recurs" in describing her general condition; her shipping, her traffic, her wealth are all enormous; and the greatness and happiness of her people are also enormous, notwithstanding all that her enemies may say in disparagement of them. Nor is that all. Her commercial correspondence has been extended to the utmost limits of the globe; and with her commodities and her manufactures she has been spreading her freedom and enlightenment in every direction, which has enabled her to effect the largest amount of good to the world. Are France and Germany as civilised as England? Possibly so; but they do not and cannot disseminate civilisation to the same extent that England does, because their connection with the world at large is not nearly so extensive.

The material grandeur of England is great; it is only equalled by her intellectual and moral grandeur, which are on a similar scale. The national established religion is supported by the State; but, apart from it, a large proportion of the middle and lower classes maintain beliefs and forms of worship peculiar to themselves, including Dissenters, Catholics, and Methodists—all classes of thinkers receiving toleration from the Government so long as they do not offend against public decency and the peace. This is a feature peculiar to England. It testifies to a

moral independence that does not develop in other countries to an equal extent. All the establishments for the diffusion of education, also, are similarly entirely in the hands of the people, and are maintained in complete independence of the Government, being amenable to no authority but that of the law. The enormous self-reliance which this implies has no counterpart in Europe. The palpable benefit of the arrangement is that it produces men in a higher degree than any other system. It is unnecessary to enumerate here the worthies England has produced. Their name is legion; and they have won for her that foremost place in the rank of nations which she undeniably holds. In her, more than in any other country, have letters been fully emancipated and made accessible to all classes of the people by the publication of newspapers, magazines, and reviews, through which the influence of learning has been immeasurably extended and all topics of interest have been made generally intelligible.

The opinion of England's physical strength is commonly a very unfavourable one; and all over the Continent it is largely believed that she is now a first-rate power by sufferance only. No strength is allowed to her beyond what is attributable to her position; if she has been secure from danger, it is only because she is sea-girt. No attempt is made to understand what she actually is, and whether her water-girdle alone by itself could have secured that pre-eminence to her. The advantage of being sea-girt doubtless made her a commercial power, and commerce gave her a maritime status which compelled the creation and maintenance of a navy. But if the navy had not been permanently maintained, her sea-girt position alone would not long have secured to her the respect she commands.

This navy, like English institutions generally, has been very slow in formation. So early as the days of Alfred the necessity of maintaining a fleet of boats was recognised, the swarms of pirates that infested the northern seas in the Saxon times rendering it necessary to have in hand the means of opposing them on their own element. This led to the first formation of a regular navy, which in the time of John did him great service against the barons, notwithstanding that it was simultaneously attacked by Philip of France; and in the reign of Edward III. the first naval victory over the French was obtained off Sluys, and the first naval victory over the Spaniards off Winchelsea, which obtained for Edward the title of "King of the Sea." There was no regular sea-service, however, till the time of Henry VIII.; while Elizabeth was the first to establish a school of Marines, in which were nurtured those daring Vikings—Drake, Raleigh, Frobisher, and Hawkins. The expeditions for the discovery of the North-West Passage, many of which were undertaken at this period, formed the best sailors; and the Spanish Armada came against an enemy that was well prepared to receive it, even if the storms had not effectually interfered in his behalf. After this a long period elapsed before England was called upon to encounter an equal peril, and, as usual with her, she suffered her navy to decline till the era of the Civil War. The exertions of Cromwell to improve it were particularly great, and the fleets under Blake and Deane disputed on equal terms with the Dutch fleets under Van Trompe and De Ruyter; but, in the time of Charles II., it came to be so utterly neglected that the Dutch were enabled easily to deal a home-thrust at England and sweep the British seas in every direction, entering even the Thames with broomstick on their mast in defiance. This rendered a

reorganisation of the navy necessary during the long struggle maintained by William III. against Louis XIV. ; and, by the reign of Anne, it became so efficient, that the French were compelled to surrender to it their pretensions to the dominion of the seas. Sir George Rooke having at the same time taken Gibraltar, and Sir John Leake Minorca, the Mediterranean was converted into an English lake ; since which time the maritime power of England has ever retained a defiant supremacy.

As we stated at the outset, those who wish to do so may here read the hand of Providence in every event that has occurred to consolidate the English power. At the Norman Conquest the winds aided the invaders, and William landed on the English coast when the Saxon king and his army and fleet were absent in the north ; and so England was conquered. Almost at every subsequent invasion, or attempt at invasion, the winds were invariably favourable to England and adverse to her enemies. The design of Charles VI. of France to repeat the exploit of the Norman was entirely defeated by the north gale ; the Spanish Armada was mainly destroyed by the storms by which it was assailed from all sides ; the threatened invasion of Louis XIV. was prevented by a strong wind from the north-west ; at a later period the expedition sent by Alberoni from Spain was discomfited by a tempest ; and still later, Hoche was driven from the Irish coast, which he had all but reached, by a storm. This would seem to indicate a continuous interposition of Heaven in the establishment of the naval greatness of England, by warding off from her all the heavy blows aimed at her by her enemies. The strength thus attained appears now to be well established ; and it is not likely that England will again, in a hurry, be exposed to such dangers as she has

passed through. Steam is said to have now bridged the Channel, by acting greatly as a safeguard against the weather, which renders it unnecessary for the invading party to await a favouring breeze. But it has given England at the same time the enormous advantage of being able to block up her enemy's ports, at the shortest notice, without reference to the weather; and, so long as her navy is as efficient as it is said to be, this alone should give her a preponderance of facilities.

But is the English navy in such a state of efficiency as is usually assumed? On this point there has been some difference of opinion; but none on the yet more important points, that England's materials for maritime strength have become virtually inexhaustible, and that it is only necessary that enough of these be kept in constant readiness for sudden emergencies. The mercantile fleet of England comprises about twenty-two thousand sailing-vessels and four thousand steamers, the total number of seamen employed in it being more than two hundred thousand, of whom about one hundred and eighty thousand are British-born. The nearest approach to these figures, at a very considerable distance, are those furnished by the statistics of the United States; but the countries of Europe are nowhere for purposes of comparison. The bone and sinews of a navy are necessarily in the number of seamen a country can bring forward in her need, and in the celerity with which she can provide fit vessels and arms for them. As regards vessels, it is necessary only to observe that the passenger-ships of England on any one "line" will bear a comparison, in numbers at least, with the national squadron of any other country; and that any number of additional ships of any strength can be constructed at the private dockyards in England sooner than they can be made any-

where else. Similarly, in the manufacture of war materials, England works cheaper and better than all the other powers ; and her private firms can turn out on a pressure as much of them as all the Government manufactories in the other countries taken together. Most of these other countries come to England for their iron-clads and their guns ; and those that do not, employ English engineers to work for them or instruct their workmen. With ships and materials of war, therefore, England can, apparently, be sooner and better supplied than any other country.

As to the actual state of the British navy, it may be admitted that even now it has not attained a theoretical standard of perfection, though for all practical purposes it seems to be quite equal to any emergency. The only other naval powers of any pretensions are America, Russia, and France. The Americans themselves have of course loudly maintained that in ship-building, as in everything else, they have left the Britishers a long way behind ; while the truth is, that not more than one-fifth of their so-called navy is seaworthy, the remaining four-fifths being only fit to be sold 'as old iron. Russia has been building some large ships ; but it is generally understood that these vessels have not answered expectations, and, though they may prove well enough for coast-defence, are not fit for other work. The French vessels, if not absolutely rotten, are all obsolete, and would not long stand the booming of English guns. Germany and Italy have each the nucleus of a good navy—namely, a few good ships—but nothing that can cause any alarm to England. In the absence, therefore, of greater efficiency on the part of her probable enemies, the perfection England has attained may well be accepted as conclusive, since she has a large number of ships, most of which are in superb condition.

The army of England is not of course very strong, and, strictly speaking, the maintenance of a standing army in time of peace is opposed to the spirit of the Bill of Rights. She has kept up an efficient navy only to protect her commerce, which is scattered all over the globe ; but she does not seek for military renown, and her policy has always been deliberately and systematically to keep down her army, that she might devote all her energies to the development of the arts of peace. The navy, we have seen, began to be organised from the time of Alfred, the Saxon. The formation of an army dates from a much later era. The Normans, and William the Conqueror above all others, built castles and fortresses ; but they had no standing army. They relied for the supply of troops on the aid of the feudal barons and other tenants of the crown who held their fiefs on condition of military service ; and also on bands of mercenary warriors. The first regularly-formed arm of the military service was the archer-corps, which was introduced by the Normans for utilising the yeomen of England by training them to this service ; and, in the olden wars, this corps was always the most formidable on the field. The formation of a regular staff of officers for the army dates from the reign of Elizabeth, when it was organised in connection with the wars of the Dutch Protestants and the Huguenots, and those of the Netherlands with France. The great Civil War called into active existence a deal of energy and excellence in all soldierly qualities ; but these were not exercised against any foreign enemies, but only against each other at home. A fair army was formed by the reign of Anne, when the genius of Marlborough gave a prestige to the English name, and shattered the power of the greatest European monarch of the day ; and the

success thus secured was transmitted to the era of the Georges, and culminated in the triumph gained at Waterloo. But it cannot be said that at any time of her history England has taken much pains to organise a grand army equal to, or approaching to an equality with, any of the great armies maintained on the Continent.

This has given rise to the cant that the English are not a military nation. All that is true is that the English have never betrayed an appetite for glory and war. But they have at all times evinced self-sacrifice and enthusiasm in the military service of their country with an amount of physical courage that has never been surpassed. The victories of the English army are well known, and have been referred to. The worst defeats of England were those sustained under the Duke of Cumberland at Fontenoy and Laupfelt, and in his weak defence of Hanover against the French, which led to the ignominious capitulation of Clostersevern. With reference to the first two, the French commander, Marshal Saxe, candidly admitted that the British infantry did all that could have been done under the circumstances, and what no other troops in the world would have imitated; and greater praise from an enemy was never received. It is clear, therefore, that England has, in this respect also, the right materials to work with. The regular English army is, it is true, very inconsiderable, as compared with the armies kept up by the Continental powers; and it is doubtful if England could materially augment its strength without interfering with her domestic and mercantile economy. But every Englishman knows how to fight, and the emigration statistics of Great Britain show to what extent her rank and file can be replenished in the hour of need by the payment of a liberal bounty. England has therefore no

need to swell up her regular army with useless soldiers. The fears of sudden annihilation by a *coup de main* are childish and unworthy of being entertained. No great nation ever has been, or could be, suddenly wiped out. It is true that nations now arm themselves *en masse* for war, and seek once for all utterly to crush the adversary they have to deal with; but, in the case of Britain at least, no invader could ever come over *en masse* to the scratch, while it will always be in the power of the people invaded to rise *en masse* in their own defence.

The general tenor of success on their side throughout the whole course of their national existence has made the English people believe themselves to be invincible; and the pride is not yet extinct which makes them assume that, in respect to physical strength and courage, one Englishman is equal to two men of any other country in the world. On the other hand, the peaceful occupation of the nation generally, and their aversion to assume a belligerent attitude, are marked; and all the Continental powers believe that England, in her quiescent state, already shows symptoms of decay. It is scarcely necessary to combat this belief. As a country devoted to peaceful occupations, England is naturally averse to take offence; and her first efforts to resent it when given are, as a rule, feeble, ill-directed, and abortive. But, if unprepared at the outset, she soon makes up her deficiencies by her fortitude and perseverance; and in all wars she has hitherto always been successful at the end. The conclusion of the Crimean war, in which England figured so unfavourably, found Russia, not humiliated only, but also perfectly exhausted. In France the result was nearly as embarrassing, provision rising in price and capital being withdrawn from internal industry. But

England did not suffer from the consequences to any perceptible extent. Her means and appliances were, on the contrary, augmented; and she found herself stronger towards the end of the war than she was at the beginning of it. This is not a proof of decline. The preponderance of evidence is all on the other side. It is only under the house of Hanover that England has enjoyed the plenitude of her greatness. After a long trial of courage and patience was this exaltation attained. It is yet too early to say that the hour of triumph has passed by. The constitutional liberty of the country and her indomitable energy still remain; and so long as they do remain, there can be no real decline in her power. Other countries, it may be, are gradually coming up to an equality with her; but there is no sign to indicate that her motion has become retrograde, or even that she has come to a halt. She has herself made the greatest noise of her disasters and shortcomings. She has not only detected her own deficiencies, but has made almost a parade of them on all occasions. No other country in the world can afford to do so. But is that a sign of decline, or of the greatest self-correcting vigour? In other countries victories are exaggerated, and defeats concealed or palliated. It is in England only that the most indubitable success is severely and even maliciously criticised.

There is no doubt, however, that old States do become effeminate by efflux of time, and first become stationary, and then begin to decline; while younger States, prompted by greater resources, wants, or energies, gradually rise to an equality with them, and eventually outstrip them in the race. Russia is the youngest of the European communities, and, with her increasing population and limitless territory, is not unlikely to outstrip the older States

in time. The United States of America, from similar or still greater advantages, may in like manner come to arrogate for themselves an excelling position. This it is not in the power of England, or of any other country, to prevent. But the relative condition of the parties has not yet been so changed as to justify the entertainment of any fears of England being thrown backwards soon. The only fact against her is that her greatness is disproportioned to her size and population; but that does not necessarily imply that the time for rectifying the disproportion is at hand. Pitting the British Empire as an aggregate against any other power, the superiority still remains with her, and will do so for a long time to come; though, in the course of centuries, it may be her lot to come down to a position nearer equality with a few of her rivals.

The general hatred of England all over Europe and America is well known; and there is no doubt that this has arisen mainly from the arrogance of the English character and the vituperations of the English Press. It is also attributable to a feeling of envy common to all nations who see in England an advance too great for them to equal, and wish heartily that she may come down that they might thereby be enabled to overtake her. The crowing against her comes from every quarter. It is now the Gallic hen that sputters through the mouths of her strutting colonels, and boasts of being able to uproot the British Islands from their foundations in the sea; or it is the staid Prussian general or semi-military politician, who calculates on paper the feasibility of conquering England at this time of the day by invading it again in Norman fashion; or it is the astute Russian, who complacently praises his own moderation that prevents him from overrunning the diamond-paved shores of India; or it is the

tall-talking Yankee, who boasts of his ability to whip Creation, Canada, and England out of existence. But which of these powers alone is at this moment equal to England? In England it is the genius of the nation that rules, fights, and acts on every emergency; and the genius of a great nation pitted against the genius of one mind, however great—be it Napoleon's or Bismarck's—cannot but be successful in the end. No sudden blow, however great, could possibly paralyse the energies of a stubborn people like the English; no French, Prussian, or Russian victory could humiliate England except for the passing hour. A war with the United States would perhaps be somewhat different; but, as yet, the old mother is more than a match for the virago that disowns her birth. One thing is certain—that the ruin of England, when it does come, will be a calamity to the world, which will not be remedied by the greatness of either Russia or America, or of any other country yet known to us.

CHAPTER III.

THE DEPENDENCIES OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

COLONISATION is an inseparable adjunct to every great State, but more especially to an insular kingdom of small size like the British Isles, the energies of which are circumscribed within a limited sphere. Every prosperous country has a tendency to become redundantly rich and redundantly peopled, and for these exuberances of wealth and population new outlets must be found, new lands discovered and reclaimed, and the foundations laid for new communities. The prosperous manufacturer requires a wider sphere for the disposal of his wares than the home-market affords ; the prosperous merchant more extensive marts for profitable traffic ; the wealthy capitalist an opener range for the investment of his superfluous wealth. Colonisation for these ends is the natural remedy for inevitable overgrowth ; and the nation that has resort to it, instead of being weakened or impoverished, is only rendered stronger and richer by such depletion.

This has conspicuously been the case with England, which has for that reason been named the "Mother of Empires." She has extended herself in every direction, as widely as it was possible for her to do so : from the icy regions of the arctic to those of the antarctic circle ; from the East Indies on one side, to the West Indies on the other ; over every soil and in every clime, implanting

or civilising, and in either case widely extending her language, laws, and liberties, and contributing to the well-being of the human race. Wondrous is the empire that has thus been established, and just the proud boast that on that empire the sun never sets, for it embraces about one-seventh of the land surface of the globe, and very nearly one-fourth of its population ; and the wealth which these dependencies bring to the mother-country is so exuberant and diversified, that it has been correctly observed that there is absolutely no produce of Nature that is not grown on British soil.

The rage for colonisation and distant possessions sprang into existence with the commencement of the seventeenth century, previous to which England was but a small insular kingdom that scarcely gave promise of the expansion it was destined to receive. At this period almost half the globe was divided by treaty, as well as by an order of the Vatican, between the two great empires of Spain and Portugal, when a strong contest for power arose, other nations having intermediately become anxious to share in their aggrandisement. Fortunately for England the age was that of the wise Elizabeth, who was encompassed by a bevy of administrators whose ability has perhaps never been equalled. They foresaw the coming events of the age, and directed all their energies to turn them into shape, founding the first steps of that greatness and maritime dominion which were subsequently attained. The progress of England was slow and gradual, but always well sustained ; and everything gave way before it—the opposition alike of Spain, Portugal, Holland, and France.

The first colonies of Great Britain were the United States of America, to which we shall separately refer.

Since those States became independent, the chief colonies of Britain have comprised Canada, Australasia, the Cape of Good Hope, and the West Indies; while India, though not a colony, shines out from the centre of Southern Asia as the brightest jewel of the British crown. As her hold of India gives Great Britain the greatest prominence in the scale of nations, as it has contributed most of all to augment both her wealth and her power, and as it has, moreover, opened all Eastern Asia to European commerce and civilisation, we shall first notice this great dependency of the empire, before passing on to the colonies proper we have named.

India.

The history of the British Empire in India has no parallel in the records of time, but much in regard to it does not require to be said in this place. The first appearance of the English on Indian soil was only as suppliants for the establishment of mercantile residences, the suppliants being well armed, though at that time not dreaming of conquest or dominion. They were armed, not against the native races among whom they appeared, but against their European rivals, the Dutch and the Portuguese, with whom they were constantly at war. From these contests originated that military reputation which the English were soon enabled to establish in the East, and which led to their being courted, not only by the Great Mogul of India, but also by the Sháh of Persia. Both these sovereigns utilised their services for the destruction of pirates, and, at the price of the aid thus given, many of the commercial advantages sought for by the adventurers were obtained, with a local habitation in

India which served as the nucleus from which they expanded. The English East India Company was formed in 1600, and its first trading fleet went out in the following year to commence operations on some of the islands to the south-west of the peninsula. The first factories on the mainland were established in Surát, Áhmedábád, and Cambay, in 1612; and in the next ten years some factories were also opened on the Coromandel coast. The construction of a fortified factory at Madrás-pátám was permitted in 1640, about which time permission was also obtained to set up a factory at Hooghly. Bombay was obtained in 1668 from the Portuguese, as part of the dowry brought in by the Infanta of Portugal on her marriage with Charles II. After this, the disruption of the Mogul empire led to the factories being armed; and the native powers that sprung into existence from the ruins of the empire, appreciating the courage of the foreign merchants, were glad to enlist their assistance in their contests with each other—an assistance always rendered with alacrity, as serving to secure that commercial position which had already been established.

For the first hundred years the great rivals of the English in the East were the Dutch and the Portuguese. The French came in later, but soon succeeded, like the English, in securing a surer footing on the soil. The times were troublesome and critical, and things had come to that pass that any clever adventurer who could collect a force of irregular troops, or even a gang of robbers (and there was not much real difference between the two), could hope to found a sovereignty, as was actually done by Sivájee and Hyder Álly, and a host of others of lesser name. The French were the first to discover that these native armies were not able to withstand European

troops, but that they could be disciplined on the European model and their services then utilised. They also discovered the art of setting the native States against each other to weaken them; and, with these discoveries, they had every prospect of founding a permanent empire on the ruins of the Mogul throne. Their knowledge, however, did not long benefit them; it more fully benefited the English, who received it from them at second-hand, and then adroitly turned it against them. The two powers established side by side in the country, and almost on an equal footing, soon found the expulsion of one of them to be an unavoidable alternative to the other; and this brought them readily at loggerheads with each other, when they began to raise armies which were paid for by the princes whom they affected to support, while they fought on their own behalf. Another advantage simultaneously gained by both parties was that, on pecuniary payments failing, territorial assignments were obtained from the princes, which brought with them the exercise of civil as well as military influence. The first English possessions on the Coromandel and Malabár coasts were, almost all of them, acquired in this manner. In Bengal, the *Dewánný* was acquired from the hands of the expiring Mogul, when the assumption of such authority had become necessary to the Company for self-preservation. The French power collapsed at about the same time, from 1760, after the battle of Wándewásh, the last turning-point in a prolonged struggle which had been carried on with various vicissitudes for a long series of years. This led to the annexation of extensive territories to the British settlement of Madrás, and on these foundations was raised the stupendous dominion now owned by the British in India.

We have not dwelt on the question of right or wrong as connected with the acquisition of this authority by the British ; it would be simply useless to discuss such a question now. All the proceedings of those days cannot be vindicated, and no one understands that better than the nation by whom Warren Hastings was impeached and tried. But the existence of the English in India depended on the steps that were taken ; and they have ever since endeavoured to make all the amends in their power for such injustice as was done to the country at the outset. The struggle with France was fierce and obstinate, and on both sides intrigue had as much play as force ; and these intrigues were directed not only against the principals opposed, but also against their allies. In Bengal, the persecution of the Mahomedan rulers gave birth to reprisals on the part of the English, which were not perhaps as just as they were successful ; but the enforcement of authority on a foreign soil always implies some injustice of that sort, and it must be admitted that the English name has not been very free from stain in this respect.

The sovereignty of the East India Company in India commenced from 1765, all the territory from Calcuttá to Alláhábád and Lucknow having been intermediately occupied. The Nawáb of Bengal had in fact been so much reduced, that he was glad to purchase peace on any terms, and willingly paid all the charges of the war which made him a puppet in his own dominions ; and the Court of Delhi was equally eager to confirm the conquerors in the possessions they had acquired. The political importance thus gained was so great that the Imperial Government now came forward to claim a share of it, and, in 1772, it was determined in Parliament that all civil and military correspondence regarding India should be submitted to

the king's ministers ; that a supreme court of judicature should be sent out to India by the Crown ; and that the country should be divided into three presidencies, and made subject to a Governor-General and Council, the former of whom was to be approved by the king. The administrative arrangements have since then been considerably modified and improved ; and, from the Sepoy War of 1857-58, the direct management of the country has been assumed by the Crown, and devolves on a special Secretary of State.

The first native attempt to overturn the British power was that made by Hyder and Tippoo, sovereigns of Mysore, at the instigation of the French. Then followed the attempts made by the Mahrattás and their great chiefs named Scindiá and Holkár. These were succeeded by the aggressions of the Pindáris, a set of freebooters actively abetted by the Mahrattá princes. On the outskirts of the country the English had also to fight the Nepálese and the Burmese. All these may be received as indications that the native races did not relish the dominion of Great Britain, and did not accept it without demur, and that the imposition of it on them, notwithstanding such sanguinary protests, was only an unjustifiable assertion of the doctrine of might. This doubtless was so ; but, having obtained the sovereignty of the country, England was no longer in a position to recede.

But, though the rule of England in India was thus based on force, which is at all times more or less inexcusable, it has, nevertheless, practically been very kind, just, and beneficent. Up to this day its character is that of pure despotism, but civil, not military, and regulated by great wisdom and leniency. History gives no example of a conquest so completely turned to the good of the vanquished.

What was the country before, under the domination of the Afgháns, Moguls, and Mahrattás, but a theatre of perpetual anarchy and confusion? What is it now? A mutiny or rebellion has passed over it. Did any sane man in it believe that any native king would have governed it as well as it was being governed by strangers? Under them the entire country is at peace, from one extremity of it to the other. With a few isolated spots on the frontier excepted, this has been the case for a long series of years. When was this the case before? The Suttee, infanticide, and human-sacrifices have ceased. Irregular exactions have been superseded by a regular taxation. All the races in the land are being initiated in civilisation. Justice is afforded to rich and poor alike, where injustice and oppression were triumphant for ages. Schools have been set up in every nook and corner; while three universities, one in each Presidency, superintend the education of the higher classes.

It is said that the people have not yet got reconciled to English rule; but this is only true after great qualifications. The government of a foreign people, however liked, will be borne so long merely as it is enforced, or so long as the people believe that it will, or can, be enforced. The prestige of the English name after the suppression of all internal opposition, was well established, and there was a contented submission everywhere from that time. This was disturbed by the Afghán war. Under the influence of an attack of Russophobia, Afghánistán was invaded with the avowed object of expelling from it the reigning sovereign and setting up in his place a British puppet; and to this end Kabool was taken and occupied. The indignant Afgháns repelled the outrage both by violence and deceit; upon which a capitulation to evacuate the country was signed.

The evacuation was met by faithless onslaughts, the whole of the retreating army was assassinated, all the women were taken prisoners—many of whom were never rescued. An avenging army went to repair a mischief that did not admit of being repaired. Kabool was reoccupied, and a great extent of territory was overrun and laid waste ; but the country was found untenable, and the avenging army had to be withdrawn. The great mistake of accepting a position in which the British power appeared to be weaker than that to which it was opposed, was not rectified. The prestige of the English name was lost, and has not yet been fully re-established.

The first result of the Afghán war was the contumacy of the Ámeers of Scinde, a kind of feudal lords who occupied the lower delta of the Indus. They were easily conquered and their country taken—an arrangement which Sir Charles Napier, who recommended and gave effect to it, could only defend “as a very advantageous, useful, and humane piece of rascality.” The next affair was more complicated—namely, the quarrel with the Sikhs. They attacked British territory, and were repelled and their power overthrown,—but after such hard fighting as had not been witnessed in India since the days of Lake and Wellesley. We cannot help stating it, but the fact is undeniable, that this semi-barbarous people fought more heroically for their homesteads than did the French against the Germans in the last war between them.

These victories went a great way in reimpressing on the native mind the invincibility of the British arms. But, as we have said already, that end has not yet been fully attained. The annexation of Oude on the mere pretext of misgovernment was sufficient to lead to the Sepoy War, the Sepoy having imbibed the notion that,

if he only resisted as the Afgháns did, the English would disappear. The suppression of the revolt has quieted men's minds for the time, but it takes a much longer time to re-establish a good name than to lose it, and it cannot yet be said that the English are as much feared in India now as they used to be; and this is the real source of their weakness in the land.

As for invasion from without, it is only interested parties that revive the old fears about them from time to time, in the hope of being able to force on their Government the adoption of such measures as would enhance the value of their services at the cost of the State. The wish of the Russians to invade India is a pure myth; nor could they take it if they wished it. All that they could do, if they were really so foolish as to attempt it, would be to bring down a weary and exhausted army to the banks of the Indus, to find there their graves. Vambéry significantly points out that Russia would not have to bring down forces from St. Petersburg or Moscow, but only from the Siberian forts and from her stand-points in Central Asia. But what is the strength of her garrisons there? In Central Asia she has never yet been able to muster in greater strength than is represented by twenty thousand fighting-men. Will an army of that strength, or twice that strength; or three times that strength, conquer India? The military force of Britain in India consists, in round numbers, of sixty-five thousand European troops and one hundred and twenty-five thousand native troops, besides which there are about four hundred thousand native troops maintained by the feudatory chiefs, more than half of which would be available to the British Government in time of need. All these are well-disciplined forces, not likely

to be vanquished before they are considerably outnumbered.

Of course Russia can outnumber these forces by bringing down the Afgháns with her. The Afghán is vengeful, and still harps on the Kabool massacres, which have not yet been avenged. "Come, let us go and plunder India together," would be an invitation which the wild mountaineers would never refuse. But, thus brought down, how are they to be forced back again? They have more claims on India than Russia has, having in times past given conquerors and rulers to the land. Long before India was well occupied, the allies would be quarrelling on the merest trifle, and then it would be the Russians, not the Afgháns, that would have to retire.

Perhaps greater danger to India may be apprehended from a Russo-American alliance, and the termagant young lady across the Atlantic would not be very unwilling, perhaps, to lend herself to any enterprise calculated to embarrass her thriving mother. But Russia, if not infatuated, will think twice before embarking on such an undertaking, as the struggle would necessarily be long and obstinate, and a protracted war with England is what she will be least able to maintain. Even France was unable to carry on such a war with England when they contested with each other for supremacy in India; and the extent to which Russia broke down after the Crimean War would seem to indicate that it would be hopeless for her under similar circumstances to prevent her own combustion. The Czar, says Vambéry, is constructing railways to facilitate the passage of pilgrims to holy places and of soldiers to India. Be it so. If England can properly utilise the strength she has in India itself, she will be quite able to repel all the Cossacks that

the railways of the Czar could bring against her. Armed with Snider rifles, the Punjábecs and Rájpoos—leaving aside the Mahomedans, who need not be trusted—will be more than a match for such soldiers as the Cossacks.

But are not Vambéry and the other Russophobists mistaking Russia's object altogether? A regular army can now, says Vambéry, be transported in twenty days from the shores of the Caspian to Herát. But Herát is not the key to India, as was long erroneously supposed. Across Afghánistán is a wild raid to ride. People who talk of the march from Herát to India appear to forget how the army of Napoleon I. fared on its invasion of Russia; and yet that was an invincible army led on by the greatest warrior of the age, with generals subordinate to him almost as able as their chief. An army that attempted to cross over Afghánistán to come to India would fare much worse. Herát, therefore, does not open India to the invader in the least. It only opens Russia's path to Persia. If it be that Russia is preparing for the thorough and simultaneous subversion of the Mahomedan power in Turkey and Persia, England has no call to oppose her to thwart that consummation. She has got a very turbulent Mahomedan population in India to control, which will be less so when the Turks and the Persians cease to be independent; and for the preservation of the balance of power in Europe, England has no particular need to interfere, since no one has more heavily freighted that balance than herself.

We do not deny that it is in the power of Russia to provoke a collision with the English if, knowing her risks, she chooses to do so; and this may convulse India and throw back her civilisation for half a century: but it can do nothing more. The people of India are as a

rule contented, if not happy, under their present rulers. The Hindu races have no particular reason to hate them, and freely admit that their conquerors are zealously working for their advancement. Some Hindus, it is true, joined the Sepoy revolt, but only as dupes; and they well remember the lesson that was taught them on that occasion, and are not likely to rise again. The approach of the Russians may make the Mahomedans restive: but it is not probable that even they would prefer the Russians as masters in place of the English; and, though they may wish to fight for their own hand, in that they know they have not the slightest chance of success. Russia would not back them to restore Mahomedanism to India, and the Mahomedans would not submit to the Russians with any better grace than they submit to the English. Were it possible, then, to shake the firm seat of England in India even for a time, it would only be to wear out the Russian and Moslem powers against each other.

The territories held by England in India comprise an area at least eight times as large as that of Great Britain and Ireland, with a population five times as numerous, the latest returns giving the population of the British territory in India alone at one hundred and ninety-eight millions. The natives of the country suffice for the cultivation of the soil and the development of its resources, while the service of the Government and the occupations of trade find employment for the large number of Europeans now supported by it. The revenue of India amounts to about seventy-two millions sterling; and, if the expenditure comes up to a nearly equal sum, or between seventy and seventy-one millions, that includes the handsome remuneration paid to Europeans for service and on other

accounts, by which Great Britain is largely and directly benefited. The imports of merchandise to India are valued at about sixty-two millions, and the exports from it at about seventy-six millions. A dependency so rich was never possessed by any country before: well-governed and consolidated, it would make a first-class power of itself; and fully does it account for the envy with which the success of the English in India is regarded by other nations. But what other nation would have proved equal to the trust, and have done half as much good to the country held under subjection in return for the advantages reaped from it? The people of India had a civilisation of their own when they were subdued, and that accounts for Christianity not having been able to supersede Bráhmanism or Mahomedanism; but, short of that, the teachings of the English have been fully appreciated, and are emulated and followed, and even the ethics of the English code are now in the ascendant in a country which had long retained a name for perjury and dishonesty. And through India, all this civilisation has, to the glory of England, been refracted to China, Japan, Siam, and Persia.

Canada.

Of colonisation proper the noblest result obtained by England was the formation of the United States of America, which have since become independent. Notwithstanding their defection, however, a very fair portion of the North American continent is still an integral part of the British Empire, adding to it an area of three and a half million square miles, and a population which has already risen to above four millions. The Canadian

Dominion, as this territory is now called, comprises Canada (East and West), New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and Cape Breton, with the whole of the Hudson-Bay territory, which is almost uninhabited. The first of these, Canada, was so named by the Spaniards (*Capo di Nada*, or the Cape of Nothing) when they went to it in search of gold and were disappointed. The first to settle in it were the French, who named it *Nouvelle* or *New France*. A party of convicts colonised it so early as 1598; but no regular settlement was formed till 1608, or about the time when the Pilgrim Fathers went out from Britain to colonise New England. The wars between the English and the French were at this time very frequent, and the French colonies in America came thus to be several times taken and given back. Canada was finally wrested from France by Gen. Wolfe, in 1759, and formally ceded by the treaty of 1762. At this time all its wealth consisted of the skins of the bear, the beaver, the buffalo, the fox, the marten, the mink, and the wolf. The wealth and resources of Canada now are quite equal to what the wealth and resources of the United States were at the commencement of their career of independence. Next to England and the United States she has the largest mercantile marine in the world.

New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were both portions of *New France* or *Acadia*, and were colonised in 1604. After having been lost and restored on several occasions, they were finally transferred to Great Britain in 1713, though they continued to be a source of contest till 1762, or the time when Canada was formally ceded. Prince Edward Island had been little used by the French, and was not settled till after the conquest of *Acadia* by Great Britain, when many of the French colonists crossed over

the narrow strait to occupy it. It fell into the hands of the English in 1758, when Cape Breton also was taken.

The Hudson-Bay territory was named after Hudson, who proceeded in that direction in 1610, on an expedition in search of a north-west passage to India. In 1670, a company, called the Hudson-Bay Company, was formed for the appropriation of this *Terra Incognita* and the development of commerce in it. These owners held under the words of their charter all the lands and territories lying within the entrance of Hudson Strait not already owned by Great Britain or actually possessed by any other State—that is, all the tract from Labrador and the Atlantic Ocean to British Columbia and the Pacific, the total area of which was equal to about one-half of Russia, and to thrice the size of India. Of course the Company could make no use of such extensive possessions, though they held them for nearly two centuries. All their operations were confined to the prosecution of a trade in furs with the Indian tribes residing in the country, which gave them very large profits—so much as fifty per cent.—to secure which, and prevent the country being colonised, the worst reports about it were sedulously propagated. It is sixteen years now since this vast territory was transferred to the Dominion of Canada. Its present condition is very similar to that of Asiatic Russia, which it resembles also in respect to climate and soil, and in the possession of illimitable forests and immense rivers. In winter the southern part of the territory is usually covered with one foot, and the northern with four feet, of snow—so much as twenty feet of snow being seen at times in some places. But the Indians nevertheless affirm that, naked as they are, they suffer more from heat than cold. All these tracts are almost waste at

present; but the near completion of the railways in hand is fast opening them out for occupation and culture.

The surrender of Canada to England, in 1759, was burdened with about sixty thousand French inhabitants and above eight thousand converted Indians, who became subjects of Great Britain, and took the usual oath of allegiance. But the troubles in store for them were heavy. Montcalm, on being defeated by Wolfe, predicted that the conquest of Canada by England would endanger her retention of the New England colonies, which already betrayed much impatience of restraint, that had hitherto been controlled only by their fears of the French. Within thirteen years after the surrender of Canada this prediction was fulfilled. The Canadians, among whom a civil government had been then quite recently established, were asked by the revolted States to join them in their rebellion, or at any rate to remain neutral during the war; but this they refused. This led to an attack of Canada, which was indignantly repelled. The country suffered much by the war; but its gain was greater from the loyalty displayed by it. Hitherto the general impression had been that Canada was in a state of dormant insurrection, and people from Great Britain were averse to proceed to it. It was now found that the case was otherwise, and immigration in large numbers was commenced, which materially contributed to strengthen it. The Government aided these immigrants by the grant of free passage, the free gift of rations and tools on arrival, and the gift of one hundred acres of land to each individual; by which means the number of English colonists was so considerably augmented, that, by 1783, it was found to be fully equal to the number of French colonists, or those who claimed descent from the

French. Between these different races, however, no great friendship was formed. The success of the English adventurers in all the enterprises they undertook filled the French with envy and hatred; while the English, on their part, looked down on them with their usual arrogance and scorn.

After the declaration of American independence, Canada was, in 1791, divided into two distinct provinces called Upper or West Canada, and Lower or East Canada, the former being inhabited by the English colonists, and the latter by the French. A representative Assembly was at the same time given to each, a boon which the French Canadians did not at that time appreciate; and, in 1807, there was an open rupture between the House of Assembly of Lower Canada and its Legislative Council, which led to the Assembly being dissolved. The position of the colony was somewhat bettered in 1811; but dissatisfaction still continued, and the Americans sought to profit by it during their second war with Great Britain, in 1812. A fresh invasion of Canada was attempted, or rather a series of invasions, which fared no better than the first. The Canadians only wanted justice from England, but had neither sympathy for the American character nor regard for American institutions. They still liked their dependence on England well enough, or, at all events, were not willing to be absorbed into the United States; and not only were the invasions of America repelled, but the scene of war was transferred to the enemy's country, Washington being attacked and captured, after which peace was willingly concluded by the United States.

The loyalty of the Canadians was for a long time ill-requited, and the French Canadians especially suffered most from domestic troubles. In both Upper and Lower

Canada violent antagonism was established between the official and non-official classes, by the power exercised by the Legislative Councils over the Houses of Assembly. Lower Canada complained, but submitted to this unjust arrogation of authority; Upper Canada threatened an insurrection and amalgamation with the United States. The rebellion in the latter lasted for three days, and induced the mother-country to send out a Governor-General over all the provinces of British North America for the adjustment of differences. A second revolt was attempted in the neighbourhood of Montreal, but did not ripen.

The suggestions made by the Earl of Durham, the Governor-General referred to, for improving the condition of Canada, were adopted in 1839. The two provinces of it were now reunited, and made subject to one legislative and administrative system; and the class-interests of the colony, which had formed the chief point of discord, were broken up by the free admission of the French Canadians into the Legislative Council. The subsequent progress of the country has been very rapid. In 1867, all the British colonies in North America were confederated under the designation of the Canadian Dominion, and since then the tide of immigration has become so strong that the population of Canada is now increasing more rapidly than even that of the United States. The field, of which no adequate use has yet been made, is extensive, and the prize held out to the starving population in England is so enticing that the future of Canada cannot but be very hopeful. Of vast tracts between Labrador and Columbia, the only inhabitants now are the wild Indians, who in no degree occupy them fully, even when they are not continually wandering from place to place. These are more attached to the English than they ever were to the

French, or are to the Americans elsewhere on the continent; but they are generally so barbarous, and so resolutely prefer to die than accept European civilisation, that, eventually, they will most probably have to disappear. The preservation of the savage races, and their amalgamation with their conquerors, may possibly have been, as has been frequently alleged, an object sought for by statesmen of every party; but the English settlers do not appear ever to have been very partial to the idea, and in every place the savages have vanished, or are vanishing, from the face of the earth. Direct hostility to them, however, cannot be charged against the English—at least at the present day; and if they are retreating before them, it is of their own accord. So far as Canada is concerned, their final disappearance is a distant contingency to consider. As yet there is ample room for all comers, without infringing on the rights of the native inhabitants: vast tracts on every side await to be tilled, and vast resources and mines of wealth remain to be utilised. The commercial value of the country, as developed at present, already shows the exports to Britain to be worth about eleven millions sterling yearly, and the imports thence about eight millions. The aggregate value of Canadian commerce, including all imports and exports, is about fifty-four millions a year.

The prevalent disease of the hour in respect to India is Russophobia. A similar disease prevails in respect to Canada, which we may call Americophobia. The relations of Canada with the United States have never been very friendly. During the civil war between the North and the South, Canada sympathised with the cause of the secession, and a great number of her citizens aided the Confederates. The irritation in the United States created

thereby still continues, though outwardly good terms have continued to be kept by both parties. A treaty has been under discussion for sometime now for securing a reciprocal concession of fishing rights, by which Canada will virtually surrender a most lucrative monopoly to purchase a free trade with the States, which may or may not be advantageous enough to outweigh her certain loss. But the good feeling of the Americans can never be purchased ; no amount of concession or bribery will ever secure it. In season and out of season they are always boasting that they have only to stretch forth their hands to take possession of Canada, although they were twice beaten back from it ; and the English nation generally have made up their minds to believe in the boast. It was at one time seriously contemplated to make over Canada to the French in exchange for their possessions in India ; but to this the French did not agree, because Pondicherry yields a large revenue, which Canada does not. It is fortunate that the negotiations came thus to be broken off. The shame of England would have been indelible if a colony had been abandoned where the English name promises to be perpetuated in the new world, as it will be in the old world in Australasia. In a short time the Canadians will be fully able to take care of themselves ; and it is only to be hoped that till then England will stand by them for all the tall talk of the United States. Nations, like individuals, are best kept up to the mark by a spirit of rivalry. This spirit has already arisen between the Canadians and the Yankees. It may improve both. The constitution of Canada is very nearly the same as that of England, and better than that of America. Will the Americans borrow from the Canadians what they will not accept from England ?

Australasia.

Australia is the largest island in the world, so large that it has been correctly called an island-continent. It is nearly three thousand miles from east to west, and about two thousand miles from north to south, its total area being not less than three-fourths of Europe. The whole of this superficial extent, however, is not available for colonisation, a great portion of the interior being hopelessly barren and impassable, forming a hollow basin of sand in dry weather, and a shallow inland sea during the rains. Immediately to the south of Australia is the island of Van Diemen's Land, or Tasmania, which is about the size of Ireland; and to the east of Van Diemen's Land is New Zealand, which, with the entire group of islands belonging to it, is nearly equal in area to Great Britain. All these have been colonised by Great Britain, and form, as it were, one family-group, though some of the settlements are very much in advance of the rest.

Australia was first discovered by the Spaniards in 1606, but was explored much later—between 1616 and 1627—by the Dutch, who gave it the name of New Holland. In 1770, Captain Cook touched upon the eastern coast of the island, at the bay which, from the number of curious wild flowers in it, he called Botany Bay. Sixteen years later, the independence of America having closed the great outlet by which the mother-country had till then thrown out her criminal population, the question of colonising Botany Bay was considered, and the first batch of convicts was sent out in 1787, and landed at Sydney in the following year. Thus was New South Wales first colonised as a convict-settlement only; and this character was retained by it till 1821.

Van Diemen's Land was first discovered by the Dutch in 1642, but was not then known to be an island, being taken for a projection of New Holland. It came to be recognised as an island in 1798, six years after which it was taken possession of in the name of the British Crown, when the colonies of Hobart Town and George Town were founded, the settlers consisting entirely, as in the case of New South Wales, of convicts and the soldiers in charge of them.

The first settlements in Australia thus established were necessarily exceedingly corrupt; and this corruption was increased by every fresh batch of convicts afterwards sent out to them. The first free settlers arrived in New South Wales in 1798, the concessions granted to them consisting of free passage, free gift of tools and implements, free gift of land, supply of necessary provisions for two years, and supply of convict labour for the same period for purposes of cultivation. Besides free immigrants, many of the old soldiers and officers, and some of the released convicts, had grants of land given to them; and six years later, in 1804, a batch of Scotch Presbyterians went out, who settled themselves near Portland Head, holding out a praiseworthy moral example to the piebald community around them. Almost the first respectable settlers were thus Scotch farmers, whose industry was crowned with the greatest success. After this, free settlers in small batches continued to go out from year to year, till the tide of immigration attained its full strength, the batches increasing in number, and taking out with them the luxuries and refinements of the mother-country, if not also a modicum of her wealth.

In their infancy, the colonies, of course, suffered greatly from various privations and disabilities. Famines were

frequent and factions perpetual where the people were generally depressed by poverty, and where their morals were necessarily very low. The first difficulty to overcome was to make the colony produce a sufficiency of food to supply its wants; and it took some time to make farmers out of pickpockets. But the natural fertility of the country was so great, that no difficulty of this sort could last long.

In 1821, the convicts in New South Wales formed more than two-thirds of its entire population; in 1828, they were hardly more than half; in 1833, they were about one-third only; and in 1839, less than one-fourth. From 1840, New South Wales ceased to be a place to which convicts were sent. After this, especially from 1847, the tide of immigration became almost continuous, the culminating point being reached in 1851, when the cry of "Gold in Australia" caused a rush of adventurers, which resulted in the rapid construction of towns and cities, and in the formation of an adequate government. Centuries would have scarcely sufficed to give the colonies that population and that fair start into existence which the cry of "Gold" called forth.

Long previous to this date the colony began to break up into sections as the dimensions and capabilities of the territory came to be understood, and as the number of settlers began to multiply. The divisions now are seven—namely, New South Wales, Tasmania or Van Diemen's Land, South Australia, Victoria, Queensland, West Australia, and New Zealand, the whole being known by the general name of Australasia. Van Diemen's Land separated from New South Wales in 1824; South Australia in 1836; Victoria in 1851, in consequence of the "gold fever;" and Queensland in 1859. The Swan-River

Settlement, or West Australia, has existed as a distinct colony from 1829, and is known as the least successful of all the colonies, though it has been rising in prosperity in recent years. Its natural capacities are not inconsiderable, and the climate is healthy; but the rapacity of the upper settlers, and the bad faith of the labouring classes towards their masters, early converted it into a scene of misery and desolation. Seeing that it did not prosper, the colonists themselves petitioned for the transportation of convicts to the settlement, which was willingly acceded to, as all the other colonies had by that time refused to take any. For a long time this was the only portion of the continent to which criminals were sent out; but the concession had eventually to be withdrawn at the entreaty of the inhabitants of Victoria, who resented the coming among them of runaway or liberated convicts from the west.

The case of New Zealand is somewhat dissimilar from that of the other settlements. It is about the latest in the order of colonisation, but almost the first in the prospects of success. The forests in it are abundant, its water-carriage is splendid, and the fertility of the soil altogether unrivalled. The colony has necessarily greatly flourished, and would have flourished yet more, but for the unfriendly feeling that subsisted in it for several years between the English settlers and the natives. The former are called Pakehas, and the latter Maoris—a bold people, who derive their descent from the Malayan race. For some reason or other the two races were, in times past, unable to agree. The missionaries did a great deal of good in the country, but the conduct of the Pakeha traders was such as to wipe off the favourable impressions they left; and a war to the knife was carried on for

several years between the contending parties, which threatened to exterminate the Maories, to the eternal disgrace of the English name. This fear has since been happily set at rest, and it is to be hoped that the peace which has been made will be lasting, which is sure to lead to the most splendid results. The colony was formally established in 1840 ; the number of European settlers in it amounts to above four hundred thousand ; the number of Maoris yet living is about forty-five thousand.

Leaving aside the exceptional case of the Swan-River Settlement, the success of colonisation in Australasia has been unprecedentedly signal. Everywhere the advance has been steady, in some places astounding ; and it has been great in all respects—social, commercial, and agricultural. The climate of the country differs widely in different places, as it must where the area is so extensive ; but much the greater part of the territory best known is healthy and agreeable, while some places are regarded as the best in the world, especially portions of New Zealand, which are considered to be very favourable to longevity. The fertility of the soil, so far as the coast-line on which the several settlements have been made is concerned, has already fully vindicated itself. All the country that yet remains in a state of nature is known to the colonists by the expressive name of the “bush,” and the capabilities of these tracts remain to be ascertained ; but, in the places already colonised, most of the productions of Great Britain are raised, and many others, especially cotton, which will not grow in Britain. The chief wealth of Australasia, however, consists in its flocks and herds ; and the rapidity with which these will increase is marvellous. Millions of pounds of wool are annually exported to England from a quarter where there was not a single sheep

before the colony of New South Wales was started some ninety-six years ago. Cows and horses thrive well, but best on natural pastures. A few tame cattle having strayed away from one colony into the bush, were found in a short time to have multiplied into a large herd on the thick and luxuriant vegetation that surrounded them. The mineral products of the country are at the same time varied and considerable. The gold-mines of Victoria and Queensland have been particularly productive. Copper and lead have also been discovered, and the mines are being worked successfully; and coal has, likewise, been found, particularly in New South Wales. All things taken together, the colonies have run a race of prosperity unmatched in the annals of any nation. The entire resources of Australia have not yet been ascertained; but it has already been established that a vast population can be maintained in it in comfort, even though the central parts of the island should prove to be utterly uninhabitable. The total population of all the colonies already amounts to about three millions, while the total revenue raised in them is about seventeen millions sterling. The extent of land under cultivation is above four and a half million acres, by far the largest portion of it being in South Australia and New Zealand. New South Wales has the largest stock of horses, and Victoria the largest after it. In cattle, also, New South Wales takes the lead; but Victoria has the largest number of sheep. The total value of exports amounts to about forty-eight millions a year, and the total value of imports to about fifty-three millions. Nor is the importance of the settlements to be appraised wholly by their commercial worth. In them England is refounding herself in the East, as she is doing in the West in Canada; and when the mother-country

shall have ceased to exist, she will still live in her children, perhaps even then the most dominant race in the world.

The form of government in Australasia was at the outset the same in all the settlements, the Governor representing the British Crown, and carrying on his duties with the assistance of Councils appointed by the Crown. But, subsequently, the English Government wisely conceded to the colonists the privilege of framing constitutions for themselves; and this permission they have availed of by setting up their own representative assemblies, and appointing their own responsible executive officers. The constitutions framed are nearly, though not precisely, alike. In New South Wales and Queensland there are a Governor, and two Houses of Parliament, one of the latter being composed of Crown nominees, and the other of members elected by universal suffrage. The constitution of New Zealand is very similar, and the House of Representatives in it includes four Maori members. In South Australia and Van Diemen's Land the old Legislative Councils have been reorganised and a House of Assembly created, the members of both of which are elected by the people. West Australia is administered by a Governor, having a Council of twenty-one members, of whom seven are appointed by the Crown and fourteen by the people. In Victoria both the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly are elected wholly by the colonists, the Governor acting only as their chairman; so that virtually the constitution of this settlement is purely democratic, at the same time that it is thoroughly loyal. The safest course for all the settlements is to continue to adhere to the constitution of the mother-country as closely as the difference between their

respective positions will allow. Sooner or later they will probably become confederated, like the Dominion of Canada.

The advance in social matters in Australasia has been considerable ; but that in literature, the sciences, and the arts, has been less, for the simple reason that the universal scramble for wealth hitherto did not allow of much time being devoted to such pursuits. This, however, promises to be remedied in due course. The preparatory steps towards improvement have already been taken, and schools and universities have been set up, which are said to be almost as good as those of the mother-country. Everything, in fact, wears a smiling aspect ; even crime, in a population partly descended from convicts, being less in proportion than in England. The only one drawback to be regretted is the antagonism between the white race and the aborigines, where it does exist, for which no remedy has yet been discovered. In the English colonies this has not assumed the proportion it has attained in the United States, the principle that the race of barbarians must perish if incapable of civilisation being—at this moment at least—an exclusively Yankce one. In Van Diemen's Land, the natives, after much contention, have entered into a peaceful agreement with the colonists, to which both parties have faithfully adhered. The colonists in Australia Proper have not been altogether as considerate ; but the interior of the island is so extensive, that colonisation and barbarism may yet for a long time find ample room in it to cultivate the triumphs of uninterference, if not of concord. In New Zealand alone did philosophy and humanity appear at one time to be unequal to tolerate the vices of the Maori character, which raised the question whether British philanthropy, placed under

temptation, was really better than that of the Americans ; and it must be added that this point has not yet been finally determined.

The Minor Colonies.

Among the minor colonies of Great Britain are : the West Indies, the west coast of Africa, the Cape of Good Hope, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, Hong-Kong, and Mauritius. It is scarcely necessary to refer to any of these in detail. The West Indies will always be remembered in connection with the frequent fighting there between the English and the Spaniards in the olden times, out of which grew the subsequent colonisation of the American continent by England ; and, also, for the grand buccaneering expeditions of the great English captains, Drake and others, who, in their day, imitated the adventures of their ancestors, the Vikings, and contributed largely, in that way, to the downfall of the Spanish power. Later, these islands, the aboriginal population of which perished early under a system of forced labour, became the theatre of that traffic in slaves in which England was the last to participate, and which she was the first to abandon ; for which her name will be remembered when all her battles and conquests shall have been forgotten. The west coast of Africa was the great field of the slave-trader during the times referred to, though its chief attraction now is on the Gold Coast, where gold is collected in small quantities. The Cape Settlement belonged originally to the Dutch, but after hard fighting was ceded to Britain, in 1815. Its limits were subsequently extended by the addition of Kaffraria, the inhabitants of which had been enemies to the Dutch, and were, for that wise reason,

treated as such by the English, till they were compelled to submit and become peaceful subjects. Ceylon was the island-home of the giant Rávana, the more modern name of whose capital was Anurádpooa, the ruins of which covered sixteen square miles, and exhibited remains of splendid architecture, of which some stoutly built of granite are yet extant. The island was first held by the Portuguese, and afterwards by the Dutch, from whom it was wrested by the English, in 1795. The Straits Settlements were also acquired from the Dutch; Hong-Kong from the Chinese; Mauritius from the French. Where, in all the world, can we point to another empire as extensive, and which is now as hopeful and flourishing, as that of which the dependencies have been named?

England with her colonies is great among the greatest powers, though without her colonies she would not be so little as some people are pleased to represent. Almost all these colonies are inexpensive to the mother-country, and self-reliant; the total value of their commerce, including both imports and exports, already exceeds one hundred and sixty-five millions sterling a year; and yet have they been frequently complained of as encumbrances, and every now and then the question is raised and discussed of allowing them to go free. If they really sought their independence England could not oppose their wish, as she did in the case of the United States. The lesson then learnt has in all respects been a salutary one, and cannot be forgotten. The loss of America did not impair the greatness of England; and it is well understood that the loss of Canada and Australasia would not do so now. Whether free of her or not, the interests of the colonies would for years remain identical with those of the mother-country, and the material loss to the latter would therefore be nominal. It

looks better, however, as it is ; the Queen of the Deep occupies her natural position when girt round by powerful dependencies ; and no cause has yet arisen for throwing them overboard so long as they are unwilling to part from her.

The cry of the defencelessness of the colonies has been frequently raised in support of the proposals to abandon them. It is asked—"If war breaks out, can England protect them all?" Perhaps not : but that is no argument for sending them adrift. With an empire so expansive as hers, England cannot possibly have appliances ready to defend every place immediately at need. But if her appliances for defence be incomplete, no other nation has the necessary appliances for assault to place her in difficulties. It is true that England cannot at one and the same moment protect all her colonies, east and west. But where is the enemy able to attack them all? Absolute security in case of war for a dominion so wide-spread can never be prearranged. But England can do what no other power can do equally well : she can very quickly close all the ports of her most offensive enemy, and prevent his doing mischief, till adequate defences are improvised. Even this would leave the commerce both of the mother-country and her dependencies exposed on the high seas ; for a universal commerce can never be adequately protected. It is for this reason, and this only, that England so meekly puts up with insult and annoyance from the more quarrelsome powers. In this sense, but in none other, is the extent of her dominion the cause of her weakness.

CHAPTER IV.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

WE do not give precedence to the United States of America over France, Germany, and Russia, under any impression of the superiority of the former over any of the latter, but simply that our notice of the Anglo-Saxon race may be continuous and uninterrupted.

The first colonisation of America from Europe appears to have been made by the Vikings, or Normans, in the tenth century, after they had founded settlements in Iceland and Greenland. The discovery of Iceland is attributed to a Norwegian freebooter, who was obliged to leave his native country on account of his lawlessness, and whose son, Eric Red, following his example, was outlawed from Iceland, upon which he went out and discovered Greenland. From this last-named place Lief, the son of Eric, passed over to Newfoundland, and afterwards to the American coast, where he explored all the tract between the present site of Boston and that of New York, founding a colony which was named Vineland, on account of the abundance of grapes there met with. In the fifteenth century, the rediscovery of the continent was made by the Cabots, enterprising merchants of Bristol, who visited the coast of Labrador in 1496, four years previous to which Columbus had discovered the Bahama Islands. The thorough colonisation of the

country was begun after this by the Spaniards, who were followed by the French and the English—the first colonisation by the English dating from the reign of Elizabeth, when Virginia was discovered by Raleigh, and settled upon.

The wrongs that the primitive possessors of America suffered at the hands of the colonists have never been fully made known. Our knowledge of those races is, in fact, altogether very meagre, and extraneous inquiries about their origin, etc., have thrown a veil, as it were, over the history of their sufferings. We do not understand the theory of migrations; and, as the American Indians do not much resemble any of the races of the Old World, we are content to believe that they are not descended from Noah and his descendants, that their origin was spontaneous, and that this was the case almost all over the world—every nation being, as a rule, the product of its own land at the outset. The name of Indians was given to the American aborigines by the Europeans who settled in their country, who supposed the tracts they colonised to be on the way to India; for which reason also the first-discovered portion of America was called the West Indies. The treatment which the natives received from the colonists was almost uniformly extremely cruel and unjust. The greatest portion of the lands taken from them was taken by violence; setting fire to their dwellings was frequently resorted to for compelling their flight; and those that did not run away were disposed of by the sword. Even the companions of Penn did not hesitate to follow this well-approved course.

The history of the first days of the colony at Virginia is relieved by the poetical tale of Pocohontas, the daughter of Powhatan, an Indian chief of that locality. Pocohontas

saved the life of an Englishman who had been captured by the chiefs of her race, was herself captured by an unprincipled adventurer, and at last found a deliverer in another Englishman, who converted her to Christianity, and married her. The child-like goodness and innocence of her character have been praised as much as her loveliness. Was she the only one of her race so endowed? And yet the Indians have been extirpated, when, like this woman, they might have been rescued and civilised. The result of the marriage, we read, was peace with the Indians, which, at the commencement of the settlement, was of course much prized. But this feeling did not last long; the English despised the Indians as savages, and were not assiduous for unions with them; by degrees animosities came to be fully developed on both sides: and this was uniformly the aspect of affairs in every place.

The colonisation of Virginia was followed by that of Maryland, Massachusetts, New Plymouth, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, which were known collectively by the name of the New England States. They were recruited, on the one hand, by convicts, and, on the other, by those who fled from the persecution of bigotry in England. These latter, known as the Pilgrim Fathers, were the bone and sinews of the settlements formed. It was their vigour that strengthened and supported all the colonies. At first their one dominant wish was to Christianise the natives; but this humane feeling soon gave way to a so-called *bonâ fide* conviction that the Indians were naturally, as well as figuratively, the children of the devil; and they accordingly treated them as such—not only with contempt and abhorrence, but also with undisguised severity.

The Pilgrim Fathers first landed in America on the

forbidding shores of Cape Cod, in the winter of 1620; and their first act was the drawing up of a voluntary compact of government. They received no power of government from the Crown, but continued to exercise every authority till they were incorporated with the province of Massachusetts, in 1691. Bancroft says that they were the knights of their age; but this is not wholly true. Of most of them it has been correctly asserted that they were merely the Jesuits of England, and nothing more. Similarly, the settlers in Virginia are erroneously understood as having been of the best blood of England. What is true is that the cavaliers who migrated thither were the younger sons of families whose wants exceeded their means; while the bulk of the immigrants was formed of convicts, who preferred crossing the Atlantic to being strung up at home. Distinguishing the distribution according to the religious beliefs of the immigrants, it may be generally laid down that Virginia was colonised by the Roman Catholics, the New England States by the Puritans, and Pennsylvania by the Quakers.

Simultaneously with the English colonies referred to, were developed the French colonies in Canada, which, as we have mentioned in the preceding chapter, were taken by England in 1759. This, which secured to England the empire she now holds in America, was also, in a great measure, instrumental to the loss of the United States. At the close of the war with France, England found herself burthened with a large debt, which forced her to raise money by colonial taxation, on the pretext that the maintenance of her armies was necessitated by the requirements of her colonies. There had been bickerings before this time between the mother-country and her bantlings in respect to the right of the former to

interfere with the government of the latter, and to regulate their commerce; but hitherto the proximity of the French in Canada had kept the discontented in wholesome fear of, and in dependence on, the parent-state. This fear was now removed, and, the mine being ready for explosion, the spark was not late in coming to set it on flame. A new impost having been proposed in the form of a stamp-tax, the colonies denied the right of Parliament to impose duties and taxes on a people who were not represented in it. There is no doubt that they had a right to say so. They had planted themselves on a foreign soil to avoid oppression in the mother-country; they had grown up almost in perfect neglect and without any thought of them on her part; in the hour of trouble they had assisted her in her wars with France, so far as the acquisition of Canada was concerned. They had just cause, therefore, to feel aggrieved when threatened with burthensome taxes to be imposed at the imperial will.

Their grievances now took a tangible form. Ten of the colonies joined in a Congress, which met at New York on the 7th October, 1765, and drew up a declaration of rights and grievances, in which all the privileges of Englishmen were claimed by them as their birthright, one of the most important of which was exemption from taxation unless imposed by themselves. This had the desired effect: the Stamp Act was repealed. But, to vindicate its honour and importance, the Parliament simultaneously passed a "Declaratory Act," avowing the principle that Parliament had a right to bind the colonies in every respect. The whole virtue of the concession was thus nullified. The Act for taxing tea, glass, paper, etc., imported into the colonies, which followed soon after, reopened the question in all its bearings; the

attempt made to enforce it was resisted ; affrays between the citizens and soldiers exasperated opposition ; and at last the disputes matured into a revolt. The declaration of independence was signed on the 4th July, 1776, by the thirteen States of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. It soon received the support of foreign powers, particularly of France smarting under the loss of her American possessions. At the eleventh hour England expressed her willingness to make all the concessions asked for by her colonies, except the acknowledgment of their independence ; but the recusant States were now conscious of their strength, and refused to treat unless their independence were recognised. The English Government is said to have descended even to the offering of bribes in their endeavours to get back their dependencies. To one General in the American army, named Reed, a bribe of 10,000*l.* and a fat appointment in H.M.'s service were proposed. "I am not worth bribery," said the General proudly, in reply ; "but such as I am, the King of Great Britain is not rich enough to buy me."

The struggle that followed was obstinate. The English had to carry on war at the same time with America, France, and Spain ; besides which, all the northern powers of Europe formed themselves into an armed neutrality, prepared to strike in against them the moment they were weakened enough for the blow. The hands of England were also full of wars in India ; and the general opinion of the world was so adverse to her cause, that the republican ranks were filled by volunteer recruits from all countries, not excepting herself. Notwithstanding all these disad-

vantages, the first battles between the disciplined forces of England and the raw levies of America were almost invariably decided in favour of the former; and the English generals had already begun to write home that the subjugation of the colonists was all but completed, when the tide veered against them, as they might have anticipated from the outset it would, considering that one party was fighting for their rights, and the other for continuing a forced control over a population already four millions strong. A contest morally so unequal could possibly have had no other termination than that which was secured by the surrender of Lord Cornwallis to Gen. Washington on the 19th October, 1781.

The independence of the United States was a relief to Great Britain. The colonies had long become a source of expense and internal involvement to her, and the distractions of a distant and divided political administration had become irritating. The question of right in the quarrel of course lay on the side of the Americans; but England's wish to coerce them was at the same time very natural. The struggle was obstinate and prolonged, but eventually the Americans won, mainly through the bravery of their German mercenaries and the devotedness of the French, and not solely, as they are now so anxious to make out, by their own exertions.

The independence of America was formally recognised in 1783, and the formation of the federal constitution completed in 1787. Of the original States ten out of thirteen possessed, down to the time of the Revolution, forms of government resembling that of the mother-country, the Governor representing the royal power, a Legislative Council the Upper House of Parliament, and a General Assembly of Representatives the Lower House. The

remaining three States—namely, New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Rhode Island—were, from their first organisation, democratic in temporal affairs, and in spiritual matters recognised liberty of conscience and freedom of worship as among their fundamental laws ; and it was on the principle of this minority that the federal constitution was based. The first union of ten States was called the Revolutionary Government. The next union of thirteen States formed the Government of Confederation, which undertook and finished the war, and signed the treaty by which their independence was acknowledged. But it was not able to do anything more ; it could not pay its debts, or even its current expenses. To form a permanent union, and accommodate the opinions and wishes of the delegates of the several States essentially differing in several respects, required further deliberation and patient management, and was finally accomplished by the convention of 1787, by which the constitution was thoroughly reorganised, and the interests of the different States merged in those of the nation, Washington being elected President of the Republic.

Thus did the Americans make themselves a new nation in the new world. Sprung from the English stock, they soon drew to themselves immigrants from almost all parts of Europe, notably from Germany, Ireland, Norway, Sweden, and France. The native-born Americans partake largely of the English character, and are intelligent and active, though not to the same extent as Englishmen ; but they rarely possess in fulness the corporeal stamina of their ancestry. The rest of the population, particularly of the Northern States, is considerably inferior in all respects, and altogether very heterogeneous ; and virtually the Americans are at present only an aggregation of races, and not a dis-

inct nation by themselves. They have not had time, in fact, to coalesce and grow together into one nation; they have not even acquired a proper name to go by. The designation "Yankee," the Indian corruption of "English," has long ceased to be applicable to them, as they have disacknowledged England; and the name "American" is much too wide and indefinite to fit them precisely. They have nevertheless fully vindicated the revolution by which they became independent. They have not only shown themselves to be quite competent to take care of themselves, but have, in the midst of the passions and dangers of democracy, and, for a long time, with the stain of slavery fastened on them, become a great power, with all the prognostics of a gigantic destiny. There is now no doubt of their daily growth to greatness, and of their being destined to great things, provided they remain faithful to themselves. But they spoil their own good name by a very large amount of undignified gasconade.

The peace concluded between Great Britain and the United States after the Revolutionary War remained undisturbed till 1812. Intermediately, several questions arose between them in respect to which they reproached each other. The English right of search gave particular offence, and the Americans were again the first to declare war, which they did with their usual foresight, while the mother-country had her hands full of differences with Canada in America, and with Napoleon I. in Europe. But the contest now was not in the cause of liberty, having originated only from a spirit of rivalry and defiance; and, the premises being different, the results also were dissimilar, as compared with those of the first war. On the ocean the fortune of the combatants was nearly equal; while on land the Americans invading Canada were repulsed, but success-

fully repelled in their turn the aggression that was made on their territory, though not till Washington was captured, after which peace was concluded, in 1815, upon England agreeing to surrender the right of search.

A long era of tranquillity succeeded, which enabled America to make rapid strides at improvement. The greatest activity was displayed in the opening out of roads and canals to connect the Western States, the great lakes, and the extensive valley of the interior with the Atlantic sea-board; the agricultural and mineral resources of the country were developed with persistent energy; very considerable improvement was made in manufactures and mechanical appliances; commerce was so widely extended that, almost like England's, the flag of the United States is to be seen flying in every part of the world; a mercantile marine was created which at this moment counts thirty-two thousand vessels, including lake and river craft; while the progress in population and wealth was equally great, the first having increased from four millions at the time of the Revolution to fifty millions—of course principally by immigration.

The great mania of the Americans yet is for increase of territory. They have already secured large possessions, both by purchase and compulsory occupation. Texas was annexed on the merest pretext, which led to a war with Mexico, and, as Mexico was unable to fight with them on equal terms, the final result was the further annexation of the provinces of New Mexico, Utah, and California. But even this did not satisfy them. Advancing into the wilderness, they have everywhere displaced the poor Indians, whose hunting-grounds have been usurped and subjected to the operations of the plough, and who have been branded as pests and savages for resisting the

march of American progress. In this the Yankees have exhibited their resolution and unscrupulousness to the greatest advantage, without betraying any inordinate share either of conscience or sensibility. Of course the country thus assumed has been, or is being, covered with flourishing settlements and substantial farms, with all the indications of comfort and prosperity. An industrial population now covers long areas where there were no inhabitants before; but it is not to be forgotten that patent rights have usurped the place of moral rights, which have been unmercifully ignored. To the thirteen States owned before have been added eighteen others—namely, Maine, Vermont, Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin, Missouri, Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and California. Besides these, additional territories known as Oregon, Minnesota, Utah, New Mexico, Nebraska, etc., have been acquired; and thus the territory of the Union has come to be extended from sea to sea. The Yankees, nevertheless, still hanker for further extension to the north and south; for Canada on one side, and Cuba and Mexico on the other. The States acquired are already filling up with white settlers and their comfortable dwelling-houses and well-tilled fields; but the question still arises—Where are their old occupants gone? “*Las Casas*, help me to believe in God!” was the exclamation of the benevolent Spaniard, when he witnessed the outrages perpetrated by his countrymen on the red-men of Peru. Has not that belief vindicated itself? What is Spain now? What her position in the scale of nations? Where is she hastening to? Is that not a lesson deserving to be read by the most go-ahead nation of the modern world? Great has been the expansion of the

United States ; marvellous the history of her prosperity : but the fall may yet be as signal as that of Spain. At every place the Indians have been basely treated, defrauded of their possessions, tricked in every bargain, and remorselessly hunted from place to place ; and all this has been done so calmly and plausibly, that *primâ facie* there is no evidence of much injustice having been done to them. It is even pretended that civilisation was offered to the Indians and refused ; offered at the butt-end of guns and in brandy-flasks. Did they misread such civilisation when they rejected it as synonymous to perjury, violence, robbery, and murder ? There are still about four hundred thousand Indians in the territory of the United States—one-half of whom are hostile to the States ; and it is not long since that one of the Presidents of the country in one of his messages said that he would hunt these to death. It is hard that the original children of the soil should thus be exterminated by those who have forcibly assumed what belonged to them ; but civilisation—American, civilisation at least—will not tread with barbarism on neutral ground.

The other great curse of America was slavery, which has only recently been abolished. At England's door lies the original guilt of having introduced it in the North American States, it having been imported by her into Virginia in 1620, or simultaneously with the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers on another spot. But nobly did England afterwards expiate her guilt ; while America dared not for a long time look the evil in the face, and, even so late as 1838, passed a rule in Congress that no petitions for abolition were to be read. In fact, the impression in the United States all along was that they could not do without slaves—even Washington and

Franklin were slaveholders ; and nothing but a civil war would have destroyed the anomaly of a people professing to be free in the extremest sense of the word, still struggling actively against the emancipation of the slave.

The civil war came. The people of the American Union were at this time divided into two great parties, distinguished respectively by the names of Democrats and Republicans, the latter including the Liberals and Abolitionists of America. The increase of this second body in the Northern States had for a long time been regarded with fear by the Southern States. The alarm was completed on the success of the former in the election of a President of republican proclivities—namely, Lincoln—who was particularly disliked by the latter. All hopes of an honourable adjustment of differences between the two factions were, by this choice, believed to be extinguished, and the Southern States at once made up their minds to secede ; and on the 19th December, 1860, South Carolina, taking the lead, proclaimed her secession—Florida, Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia following suit in January, 1861, when the Confederate flag was raised. This act was not unconstitutional, but the Northern States refused to allow it. The war was not waged by the North in any degree in the interest of the slaves. The northern people despised the negroes ; they were better prized, at least as chattels, by the people of the South. The war was waged solely for the preservation of the Union, for the maintenance of the integrity of the empire. If it had been possible to obtain this object without enfranchising the slaves, the rule of bondage would have continued to be maintained. The Northern States were sixteen in number, the Southern

fifteen ; the area of the former in square miles was about six hundred and thirteen thousand, of the latter, about nine hundred and fifteen thousand ; but, while the population of the Northern States was above twenty millions, that of the latter was only about twelve millions—including negroes ; and among this smaller population the Northerners endeavoured to create a division by declaring the negroes free.

At the commencement both parties were without standing armies, except a few regiments kept for watching over the Indians. But the Federal States, being much more populous than the Southern States, were able from the commencement to throw out against the latter a continuous human tide, which the South had but slender means to resist. The North had also great advantages in equipment, manufactories, and railway communications ; and, from its naval superiority, its commerce remained unharassed except by occasional privateers, while the trade of the South was ruined, its coasts invaded, and its rivers converted, into thoroughfares. Against all these odds the Southern States had to contend, and did contend most manfully. They fought against armies twice as numerous as their own, while their ports were strictly blockaded, which deprived them of supplies. If England and France had aided the Southerners, as was suggested by Napoleon III., it would have been all over with the Union. But the forbearance of England was not appreciated. The Americans had come to suspect that it was she that had stirred up the Southern States to revolt, and even all the *Alabama* damages which have since been paid by her have not satisfied them fully. One thing is certain, that the weakness of America has now been discovered. The vitality of the South has been established

the discontent in it, it is known, is only stifled, not put out; and the probabilities are extremely great that, sooner or later, the civil war will of itself be renewed, perhaps with greater asperity than before,—a crisis which may be accelerated at any time by the assistance of other nations, if they choose to interfere. The division of North and South existed from the days of Penn, when the Puritans of Pennsylvania quarrelled with the Roman Catholics of Maryland, and Lord Baltimore settled their conflicting claims by a boundary-line which was in effect the same, so far as it went, with that which recently separated the Federals and the Confederates. A little encouragement to the Southerners can make this division more indented and permanent.

The subjection of the South emancipated the slaves. The Southerners, of course, have not received this result as a blessing. Heretofore the slave population in the South, though not so numerous as the white population, was sufficient to relieve the latter of every kind of drudgery, and converted them virtually into a sort of aristocracy, at least as far as leisure, wealth, and distinction could do so. This position has now been altered. The freedom obtained by the slaves is being properly asserted. The women of the negroes have, for the most part, already ceased to work on the plantations. They are now, generally, usefully employed in school-teaching, shopkeeping, needle-work, etc.; and, as the wants of the race are very moderate, a little amount of labour is sufficient to raise the money absolutely required for their support. Labour, which the whites in the South were habituated to regard as a disgrace, they are now obliged to share in; and, as a large part of plantation-work can be done by low-class labourers only, the need for attract-

ing such immigrants has become great, and many inducements have had to be offered to them. But, besides this, no other difficulty has arisen. Before the emancipation, one party prophesied that the slaves on being set free would die out or be exterminated, neither of which alternatives has been verified. Another party predicted with equal confidence that the black population would, in that case, supplant the white: but this also has not come to pass. Occasional differences at particular places have arisen between the two races, and will arise from time to time; but they have nowhere assumed the character of a State difficulty of any real importance.

The present position of the United States is undoubtedly prosperous; but this prosperity is attributable only to their unlimited resources, and to the peculiarity of their position. The condition of the States is not analogous to that of any country in Europe. They have all the advantages without any of the disadvantages of the Old World. They are not straitened for room, nor exhausted of means; they have no neighbours to distrust, and consequently no armies to maintain; they are daily receiving all the redundant energies of the Old World, and are not overstocked with drones. Their only great competitor in similarity of position is Australasia, the soil of which is capable of supporting immigrants even better than that of the American States, and to which the tide of emigration has in consequence been increasing. But America has the advantage of being more easily reached from Europe, and at an expense which is within the means of almost all classes; and the sources of employment in it are also more varied and abundant than at the antipodes. These, however, are the only advantages on the American side: America derives none especially from her constitution.

The only two systems of free government now in existence are the English and the American; the latter of which was, as we have seen, established in direct antagonism to the former, and professed to be an improvement of it. The American Congress, or Parliament, consists of a Senate and a House of Representatives, with a President, who combines in himself the functions of king and prime-minister as existing in Great Britain. The Senate is composed of two members from each State, chosen for six years; the House of Representatives of members chosen for two years, the number from each State being determined by the census taken every ten years. The former are selected by the States represented, the latter by the people. Apparently these arrangements would seem to be not unlike those in force in Great Britain; but the actual difference between the two systems is nevertheless very great. In the United States the frequency of elections, the great diffusion of the franchise, and the allowances granted to the members of both Houses, cause a class of men to be elected the majority of whom have no independent means consistent with their position; whereas the British House of Lords consists of members of great independence and honesty, and even the House of Commons is replenished by men of competence, who are sufficiently independent to preserve a high tone of feeling and principle. The ultra-democratic idea that all men are born free and equal may read well on paper, but is simply absurd. All men are not born free, but under certain limitations, which exist in every government; nor are all men born equal, either in natural gifts or abilities, or in social position. It is a truism to assert that all men are equal in the eye of the law, which very truism owes its origin to the fact that all men are not *born* equal. Some distinction in selection

is, under these circumstances, absolutely necessary ; and the absence of it in America has not been particularly beneficial to her. The British Legislature is, seemingly, the most respectable association in the world ; the American Legislature is no better than a congregation of rowdies.

According to Thiers, the American Republic is an "experiment." It has been more properly named by others an "accident." "Honour," says Montesquieu, "is the basis of a monarchy, and virtue the basis of a republic ;" but the best existing model of a republic has not a very large share of either one or the other, the government being in the hands of a majority represented alike by dishonesty, vice, and meanness. No better men could have anywhere been found than those who signed the declaration of independence just a century ago. No worse men can be pointed out in any country than those who regulate the destinies of the United States in our day. The deterioration is remarkable ; the corruption general. The officials commit every misdemeanour short of stealing, because their salaries do not maintain them ; the entire administration is in the hands of political adventurers, paupers, and criminals. This does not augur well for the permanence of the constitution ; still less does it encourage imitation. The Americans are very anxious to see democracy established in Europe. The only way to secure that end is to purify their own institution—to make it worthy of adoption.

The crudities of the constitution are also great. The theory of the Union is that the Congress at Washington is only a congress or council of States for the management of their foreign or interstate affairs, each State retaining its full sovereign authority in domestic matters. It is not

a distinct establishment from the States, with separate interests and divided objects; but is merely an instrument for executing the will of the country at large, its functions being performed by men bound by local interests to particular States. This is at best but an exceedingly cambrous arrangement. It is well adapted to the present wants of the United States, but would be totally unsuited to the wants of the more polished and civilised nations of Great Britain and France. Even in America it is doubtful if it will suit a more thickly-populated territory; and people who talk of introducing it in England talk very loosely indeed. The permanence of the institution in America itself is doubtful. It has been hitherto sustained only by the geographical position of the States, their immense extent of territory, which is very sparsely populated, and the pride of that independence which was fought for and won, which has induced the people to adhere to the institutions they started with. The country in its present state has been correctly called the paradise of mediocrity, and its institutions are suited to the mediocre state only. When the limits of that condition are passed, the institutions will have to be recast and purified.

As regards the forms of administration, the difference between the British and American systems is not very great, for the simple reason that almost all the American forms of any value have been borrowed from Britain. Trial by jury, the law regarding Habeas Corpus, inviolability of domicile, the independence of courts, the subjection of every act of the executive to the ordinary operations and restrictions of the law, the distribution of power among the local and popular bodies—all these are British institutions and privileges, which the Americans have adopted at second-hand. With these for foundation-

stones, they have attempted to set up a more ostentatious superstructure than the British constitution ; but the edifice thus raised is not likely to bear the wear and tear of everyday use as well. All the good of the American system is confined to what they have borrowed from the mother-country. They abuse the mother-country in unmeasured terms, and are always ready to keep up a quarrel with her ; but they carefully copy all her time-honoured institutions, just as much as they imitate her in every branch of manufacture and industry. " You are good for nothing, old hunks ; and I will kick you out of eternity. But I like this and that which you have got, and which no one else can boast of, and I shall certainly appropriate them." Nor could America do aught better than copy Old England in all her ways. If she did so carefully, she would soon be able to correct many of her present deficiencies.

In the matter of civilisation, America is particularly deficient, and assuredly very far behind England. It is unfortunate that all comparisons of America should be with England, to which the United States are inferior in almost every respect. The contrast would not be so great if the States were juxtaposed with most of the other European countries. Golovin, a Russian by birth, though afterwards naturalised in England, may well be accepted as an unprejudiced witness on behalf of America. " An American," he says, " is an intoxicated Britisher who keeps his feet in the air, speaks through his nose, and spits over people's heads ; who aims at money-making, little caring for such a trifle as respectability." " I do admire," he continues, " the Pilgrim Fathers in search of a remote spot for the exercise of their faith ; I admire their children fighting for their independence : but I declare that their

descendants are making bad use of their freedom." This, to the present day, is the opinion of every independent observer. Where presidents are insulted or beaten, there can be no real respectability. It is true that attempts against the sovereign's life are not uncommon even in the best-regulated countries; but we are not referring here to assassinations and disloyalty. In other countries sovereigns reign by monopoly, and may and will have enemies in men prompted by fanaticism, madness, or despair. The President of the United States is, on the contrary, chosen by the nation he represents, and ought to reign in their hearts and affections. Yet even this officer, so especially selected, sits not only in constant dread of the bowie-knife and the revolver—a common fear of all potentates—but also of the whip and the cane!

Again, Golovin remarks that in America "one must be anvil or hammer, dupe or swindler, more than anywhere else. One-half of the people cheats," their victims being those who come from other parts of the world. "Out of *three* Yankees there are *four* swindlers!" "Swindlers in the North, slaveholders in the South, and border-ruffians in the West, constitute the white population of the 'glorious and great country' which boasts to be the leader of mankind." It is certain that America is not a better edition of England, as the Americans would have it. She may be called a more enlarged edition, so far as extent of territory is concerned, but she is in all other respects an exceedingly vitiated edition. The Anglo-Saxon evidently deteriorates with transplantation. He has at least done so in America and India, and, to some extent, in Australasia also. Possibly unlimited licence calls out his worst passions into play, passions which cannot develop to the same extent in the mother-country.

Swindling in America is swindling *par excellence* ; but it is not swindling only that we have to notice. New York has been called the Sodom of modern times ; in it adultery and abortions form the fundamental items of news and talk among all classes. Golovin says of persons of the middle class all over the United States, that "four or five of them combine to keep a woman in common, and know the hours when they ought not to knock at her door ;" and again, "that they keep women in public houses, quite as one would keep a horse at the livery stables." Who shall affirm that the state of things has become better since ? The keepers of private brothels have repeatedly declared before their own courts that their best customers are married people of both sexes ; and there is no doubt that the street-females of the United States are more immodest than even those of London and Berlin. Mormonism was only an improvement over this state of society ; nor could it have taken root anywhere except in America. ,

The other patent defects of the American character are the absence of refined manners, the absence of gratitude, and the total negation of heart, feeling, and benevolence. The first—the want of refined manners—has been attributed to the want of a Court. There are handsome houses, fine furniture, expensive clothing, but all devoid of that taste and refinement which confer elegance on them in the Old World. Cooper vindicates his country on this head by urging that, if there be less of refined manners in it than elsewhere, there is less also of rusticity, the extremes of society in it not being so much separated as in other countries. This vindication is not worth much. It admits the main charge, that a very high elevation of manners has not been reached. Of the absence of grati-

tude, the best evidence, perhaps, is in the conduct of America towards England. It is worthy of remark, also, that the debt of America to France was never repaid, on the mere pretext that Louis XVI. fought, not for the American republic, but for the humiliation of England. "Look not the gift horse in the mouth, but thank the giver of it," is not a principle either acknowledged or appreciated by the Americans; and yet the gift horse, in this instance at least, was a good horse, in the shape of a fleet and army, and considerable sums of money, without which it is doubtful if the cause of independence would have been so easily won. As for heart or benevolence, nothing more cold and callous than their treatment of the slave question, nothing more heartless and fiendish than their treatment of the Indians, can be conceived.

Nor has democracy developed the intellect of the nation fully. With a large development of revenue, population, agriculture, shipbuilding, etc., there has also been an extensive cultivation of literature, the sciences, and the arts, but no great superiority of standard in either has yet been attained. The best literature of America is only equal to the second and third class literature of England. The Irvings, Prescotts, Bancrofts, Coopers, and Longfellows do not rise higher than the ordinary run of authors in Europe. The number of newspapers published is very great, considerably in excess of the number published in England; but the trash they disseminate is for the most part not only inane, but mischievous, and would not find admittance in journals of the lowest class in London. One reason of the number being so great is that the States are distinct, and, journalism being rampant everywhere, every State requires distinct vehicles of its own. The demand for circulating libraries is very inconsiderable, a clear proof

that useful reading is not much appreciated. In England the people are afraid of one thing—public opinion; but the Americans are indifferent to it, and their public opinion is so low that they could not be otherwise. The best check against national debasement does not therefore exist among them.

For all these reasons, an individual Yankee has not yet become a very elevated specimen of the human race; but, congregating in numbers, the Americans form an element of great strength. They collect together and combine on every occasion, and for every purpose; and this combination has made them the most enterprising people in the world. Hence their strength for great undertakings, hence their stupendous railroads and canals, and their vast clearings of wildernesses. For everyday improvement in private life they have no genius; self-reliance as an individual virtue is not very prominent among them. But, as a nation, they are very pushing and independent. For all that, however, the leading characteristic of the people is caution, and utility the standard by which everything is weighed. They have not much originality of conception, but are very clear-sighted and practical, and are always active in improving what others originate. Great ingenuity has been displayed by them particularly in all mechanical arts, though the finish of the English producer has not yet been equalled.

As a young nation, America is sensitive to criticism; but we have not read the American character simply to find fault with it. It has many redeeming traits. In America, more than anywhere else, a man is the founder of his own fortune. It is no bar to one's preferment that his parentage is unworthy. A disreputable father does not disgrace a worthy son. Rank there is none, beyond

that accorded to the temporary possession of some elective post, which does not confer particular respect or regard. The wealthy merchant, the successful manufacturer, are looked upon as Nature's aristocrats, and well prized. In America again, more than anywhere else, service does not demean. There are *helps*, not servants, which is certainly less degrading to human nature than the servile relations as they exist in other countries. For this reason, also, the servant classes are of higher status, and even respectable people will take service.

The natural associations of the people are English. The recollections of their descent, their connection with English literature, their extensive commercial relations with England and the English dependencies, are calculated to make them English. But this tendency is repelled by an unnatural effort, the stereotyped plea for which is that the wars waged between Great Britain and the United States were all provoked by the conduct of the former, and that the injuries inflicted by her do not admit of being forgotten or condoned. But this surely is a most absurd plea. The right assumed by the mother-country which led to the Revolution was certainly more than an injustice—for it was a mistake. But, having led to resistance and final success on the part of the Americans, they, to say the least of it, can have nothing more to resent. The real cause of their ill-will is rather their deep-seated envy of the greatness of England, which eclipses the greatness they have yet been able to attain. A candid acknowledgment of this feeling would cover them with shame; and so they mouth, and gibe, and gesticulate, and make show that they do not care a bit for England's pretensions, and are only anxious to make her smart for the wrongs she has done them. To the envy of the

American people generally is to be added the hatred of their Irish section against England, which accounts for the eager desire expressed by all, in season and out of season, to get up a war between the two countries. It is not, as some explain, a mere party cry. The wish to exchange blows does exist. But with the wish there also exists the conviction that nothing would be gained by such a contest—not even the coveted possession of Canada, and that the loss on the American side would be at least as heavy as anything the Americans could inflict on England.

Brag apart, how does the question really stand? Are the Americans prepared to fight with England, or with any great European power? They have not soldiers enough to man their fortresses, nor navy sufficient to protect their ports; and, with the South in chronic disaffection, it would seem that a few vessels like the *Alabama* would suffice to dissolve the Union for good. The fact is, their long prosperity and immunity from great wars have blinded them; they require some disappointments and defeats to cure them of their overweening presumption.

The missions of England and America are very distinct. The geographical position of the former is circumscribed, but she has adopted as her mission the exploration and peopling of the distant wildernesses of the earth. America has no similar call; her wildernesses at home are large enough to engross all her energies. To clear her forests, till her soil, and utilise all her resources without looking beyond her ocean limits, except for commercial purposes, is her destiny. No two countries could have objects so dissimilar; there is no cause, therefore, why they should quarrel. That they emulate each other in commerce

can be no reason for their being at loggerheads for ever.

It is scarcely likely, however, that the Americans will get cured of their distemper soon. Not all the unconcern of England, not all her politeness, not all her attempts to please, have smoothed the ruffled temper across the Atlantic. The *Alabama* concessions of England had no object but to mollify the irritation of her largest customer ; the nation of shopkeepers were not afraid of the bravado, but solicitous to preserve the custom, of their buyers beyond the ocean : but even those concessions have not elicited a single response of kindness. It seems unnecessary, therefore, that England should concern herself further on the subject ; and it is full time now for her to drop the use of such terms as " Brother Jonathan " and " Uncle Sam," the feeling implied by which is not reciprocated. Money being well appreciated on both sides, to pounds sterling and dollars should be left the preservation of peace between the two countries. Sufferance and soft words are simply thrown away.

If she be true to her destiny, America ought, sooner or later, to be able, from her natural resources, to outrun England in all agricultural, manufacturing, and commercial enterprises ; but this, allowing a longer interval, is equally true of Canada and Australasia. In all three cases such development is merely a work of time. That America precedes the other two in the race is only because she has had the earlier start ; but the prospect in her case is scarcely as clear as in theirs. Her present prosperity is undoubtedly great ; but we must not allow it to hoodwink us. She has pushed on her population into the wilderness, opened new channels and created fresh markets for her traffic, called forth heaps and heaps

of new cities into existence. But there is a bee in her bonnet already ; it is very doubtful if, constituted as the United States are, they can long be true to themselves. The history of the world, as we read it, seems to indicate most plainly that the distinctions "Federals" and "Confederates" will not die out, and that as much blood will be drawn out of both yet as was shed in the olden times between England and France, and between France and Germany. The continuous development of the greatness of the country will depend on the fulfilment or otherwise of this prophecy. We make a present of it to the Americans, whether they receive it kindly from us or not.

CHAPTER V.

FRANCE, OR THE *GRANDE NATION*.

THE history of the *Grande Nation* is one of the most remarkable chapters in the annals of the world. With a civilisation in advance of all other countries, with an intelligence second to none, with aspirations for liberty which have nowhere been equalled, France, throughout the entire period of her existence, has hunted only after shadows—after grandeur, glory, and renown—without ever being able to secure more than a moderate share of political independence and social happiness. Naturally, the country has a compact appearance, and the people inhabiting it have always been sympathetic, powerful, and homogeneous, apparently intended by Providence to wield a sovereign influence in the world. But the vanity, fickleness, and impatience of the nation have uniformly perverted the tendency of that intent, not only to the detriment of France herself, but also to the detriment of all her neighbours. The political life of France has consisted merely of a succession of spasmodic efforts to grasp at what cannot be secured except by patient and persistent exertion; and her social condition has been that of an incendiary enjoying the mischief created by himself. A country which gave birth to Montesquieu and Fenelon, to Pascal and Des Cartes, cannot be said to be unable to produce solidity of thought and maturity of

judgment; but it is nevertheless true that the nation at large has invariably betrayed a total want of capacity to understand anything that is not absolutely superficial, and has never yet been able to manage with practical intelligence any really efficient government that aimed to secure both liberty and happiness. Theoretically, no one appreciates liberty better than the Frenchman; practically, no one in Europe has been a greater slave.

Of the very old history of France we know nothing. The same tradition that makes Britain a settlement of the Trojans, speaks of Greek settlements on the Mediterranean coast, near the mouth of the Rhône, of which the chief was Massilia, now called Marseilles. But our historic knowledge of the country does not go beyond the age when it was occupied by different Celtic tribes, among whom the Gauls were the most prominent, being particularly known for the many inroads they made into Italy, in the northern parts of which they eventually settled under the name of Cisalpine Gauls. This led to the resolution of the Romans to beat back the barbarians and subjugate their country, which was achieved by Julius Cæsar in the manner narrated in his *Commentaries*, and which forms the first great fact in the history of France.

The Romans ruled over Gaul for four hundred and fifty years, during which they effected considerable improvement by their tutelage, at the same time that they enervated the character of the people by their refinements. It followed, therefore, that when the conquerors were obliged to retire from their dependencies to defend their own country, the Gauls were unable to offer any effectual opposition to the German nations that assailed them—namely, the Visigoths, the Burgundians, and the Franks, after the last of whom France was called.

The settlement of the Franks, or Freemen, in France was effected in the fifth century, and forms the second important fact in French history. The first king of the tribe in France was Clovis, who, was converted to Christianity by his wife Clotilda, a princess of Burgundy. Clovis ruled also over Franconia, the possession of the nation in Germany, so that the rulers of France from the commencement of her history did not reign over France alone, a circumstance which led to much confusion and fighting in subsequent years. The policy of Clovis permitted the Franks to intermix freely with the Gauls; he also allowed them to intermix freely with the Britons, when, flying from England before the Saxons, they settled on French land, in the province called after them Brittany or Bretagne; and it was by these means that the Celtic element was made to predominate in the people of France.

From the accession of Clovis to the extinction of the Carolingian race, the history of France consists only of a series of petty wars and uninteresting events. The feudal system was introduced into France with the Merovingian rule. The lands wrested from the Gauls were equally divided between the conquerors, probably in the same manner as the spoil and personal effects. In the assertion of this right no special deference was paid to the chief by his followers. It is said of Clovis that a vase of extraordinary beauty having been carried off from a church in Rheims, which the bishop of that city wanted to get back, the king entreated his army to present it to him, over and above his own share of the booty, upon which a fierce soldier rushing forward smashed the vase with his battle-axe, saying: "You shall receive nothing here but what the lot gives you a right to." The lands taken were

divided among all the chief's followers on the principle of military service; but beyond that service they contributed nothing. The property acquired was considered to belong so absolutely to its owner that even the sovereign power was equally divided between the sons of Clovis after him.

The dynasty of Clovis was succeeded by that of Charles *Martel*, or the Hammer, whose father, as Mayor of the Palace, had wielded the regal power during the obscure reigns of several Merovingian princes, whose characters have been fully described by the expressive epithet *lazy*, while all their names have not been rescued from oblivion. Arrangements of this sort are familiar to us in India, where the Peishwás of Central India in the time of the Mahrattás actually ruled over the kings by whom they were employed, and where in our day Jung Báhádoor was all in all in Nepál, though nominally the king's prime-minister only.

The powers assumed by Martel were well deserved. In the growth of a little more than a century, the religion of Mahomet had pierced into Europe and subjugated Spain; and, becoming bolder by success, had now crossed the Pyrenees, and was marching rampant over France. To France and Martel belongs the honour of having rolled back the tide. The Saracens found themselves for the first time oppressed by the robust stature and reckless courage of the warriors who opposed them; the weighty strokes of the "Hammer" forced them to fall back; and thus was the further expansion of Islámism in Europe prevented. The Pope recognised with pleasure the service rendered to Christendom, and sent to the victor the keys of the tomb of St. Peter, and proclaimed him Consul of Rome. But he died shortly after; and the clergy, who resented the free-

dom with which he had applied the revenues of the Church to the defence of the Christian religion, proclaimed, on the unimpeachable authority of a vision beheld by St. Eucherius, Bishop of Orleans, that the body and soul of the defender of Christendom were burning in the abyss of hell! The words of St. Eucherius are, that he saw "Charles Martel with Cain, Judas, and Caiaphas, thrust into the Stygian whirlpools and Acherontic combustion of the sempiternal Tartarus!!"

The first great aggrandisement of France was the result of the prowess of Charlemagne, the grandson of Charles Martel, who saved Christian Europe from subjugation, on one side by the Moslems intrenched beyond the Pyrenees, and on the other by the pagan Saxons who ravaged eastern France from the Rhine to the Moselle. The Moslems were attacked by Charlemagne in Spain, and a part of that country occupied, which effectually checked their expansion; but this hostile demonstration did not prevent his illustrious contemporary, Kaliph Haroun-al-Rashid, the head of the Moslem race, from exchanging civilities with him by sending an ambassador to salute him. The Saxons were overpowered by him in their homes, and on one occasion he beheaded as many as five thousand of them—a barbarity which was execrated even in that age, notwithstanding that it materially furthered the cause of Christian conversion. By these successes he was enabled to unite all the countries and races of the West; and for this service he was crowned Emperor of the West by the Pope—a distinction which proved very unfortunate in the sequel, as French kings were not wanting in later days to emulate the greatness and glory of Charlemagne, which kept the country always involved in wars with Germany and Italy. At the time of Charlemagne the constitution of

France was a counsel-taking monarchy, and the sovereign never failed to ascertain the will of his subjects in all things that concerned them, particularly in respect to the wars intended to be waged. But the despots who subsequently emulated his achievements were not so particular. They plunged their people headlong in bootless struggles without consulting anything but their own pretensions and predilections, silencing the opposition of judgment and discretion by that magic word "glory," the witchery of which no Frenchman has yet been able to resist.

The mighty empire of Charlemagne was split up into distinct principalities under his descendants; and, correctly speaking, his grandson, Charles the Bald, was the first king of France. It was in the reign of this prince that the Norman invasions of France began to become troublesome; and by the time of Charles the Simple, the French found it convenient to compound with the invaders by giving up to them the province of Neustria (Normandy), Rollo, their chief, consenting on his part to be baptised, to marry a daughter of the king, to yield homage for the lands he held, and to accept the distinction of being one of the twelve peers of France. This arrangement was so far beneficial to France that it infused new blood into the country, in which martial habits and virtues were already falling into decay. A fusion of races did not immediately take place, but the west of France became repeopled by a mixed and valiant race, well able to resist any aggression on the French empire, either from Germany or from any other direction. On the other hand, the murderous character of the Normans was improved; they adopted the religion, language, and usages of the French; and, already efficient as soldiers and sailors, they now sat down to acquire the skill and taste of artisans. It was these

Normans and their children—not the French—who, within a hundred years after, crossed over and conquered England, just as they had acquired Normandy before, both Saxons and Franks being compelled alike to make room for them.

The universal weakness of the laws at this period gave occasion to the birth of Chivalry. The chronicles of Robert the Devil, of Normandy, afterwards known as Robert the Magnificent, seem to indicate that Chivalry sprang with him, as it was his policy to espouse the cause of the weak. But it appears more probable that this distinguishing feature of knighthood originated with the preaching of the clergy, who first directed their efforts to the same end. Unable to accomplish their object by themselves, they adroitly made protection of the weak a virtue of the knight, and introduced vows and ceremonies to make the injunction impressive. Devotion to the fair was at the same time easily blended with a warrior's duty, being only a further extension of the first principle; and this aided immensely in raising the character and position of the sex. In time other principles were added to the code, such as courteousness of manners, endurance of hardship, etc.; and they were all promptly accepted, not only by the Franks and Normans, but throughout all Europe. To France belongs the high credit of having diffused this spirit widely; and it was she also that reaped the greatest benefit from it. The formation and perfection of the language of France is attributable to it; her intellect too received a great impulse from it, especially as respects the development of poetry; and the character of her people was at the same time purified by it. Nor did the refinements thus originated terminate with the institution by which they were called forth. The senti-

ments of Chivalry were imperceptibly adopted by the respectable classes in all countries, and even to this day illustrate the feelings of gentility and education.

This was also the age of the Crusades ; and the exhortations of Peter the Hermit and the Pope were most promptly echoed back from France, whence the enthusiasm for war rapidly extended to other countries. To use the words of Anna Comnena, all Europe, torn from the foundation, seemed ready to precipitate itself in one united body on Asia. "God wills it," "It is indeed the will of God," were the shouts of myriads ; and young and old, rich and poor, knight and plebeian, girded with equal earnestness for the fight. Seven crusades were organised. It does not matter that Palestine was not rescued ; that the fightings carried on for nearly two hundred years were accompanied by a large amount of suffering, loss of life, and expenditure ; that they also cherished a fierce spirit of fanaticism and intolerance. The advantages derived from them were much greater. They brought men and races into intercourse with each other, broke down prejudices, gave birth to an enlarged system of commerce, suggested friendly combinations and political alliances, and contributed largely to the expansion both of civilisation and intellect. France also owed to the Crusades the acquisition of Normandy, Maine, and Anjou, which Philip Augustus, taking advantage of the rashness of Richard I., and the weakness of his successor, John, was able easily to resume from England.

The chivalrous feelings of the age greatly contributed to produce the Crusades ; and the Crusades, in their turn, reacted on Chivalry and fostered it. Several orders and associations of knighthood arose among the crusaders, the members of which united the character of monks with that

of warriors—probably without improving either. But a combination of this kind was one of the necessities of the age; and these orders supplied that necessity by furnishing additional illustrations of practical Chivalry. They professed celibacy and poverty, and performed religious duties at the same time that they exercised themselves in arms, guarded roads from robberies, and afforded protection to the weak. The two principal orders were the Knights of the Temple, and of St. John. In the course of time, many persons of rank and property entered these fraternities, making over to them all their private estates. It was then that the governments of the countries to which they belonged, or in which their headquarters were located—notably the government of France—began to accuse them of great crimes, with a view to deprive them of their possessions. It is not that the orders were ever so bad as they were represented; but the necessity for their existence having gone by, it was found profitable to abolish them; upon which the estates of many were forfeited to the king.

After the Crusades the history of France is taken up by a century of desolating wars, carried on with it by England, in support of the idle claim to the French throne set up by Edward III., by right of his mother Isabella, a French princess, which was barred by *salique* law. Previous to this period there had been no very serious hostility between the two countries, which was rather fortunate than otherwise for France, as the Norman kings of England were very powerful and spirited, which their contemporaries on the French throne were not. The wars now commenced were carried on through the reigns of five French and five English sovereigns. The French had the advantage of fighting a war of defence in

their own country, notwithstanding which the English had invariably the advantage over them for several years. In almost all the actions that took place, the French displayed their usual contempt alike of danger and discipline, and the English their cool and deliberate intrepidity. The sufferings caused in France were not less deplorable than the wicked and angry passions which were excited, and the lasting resentments which were established. From this time forward *perfid*e Albion and France were almost always at daggers drawn; but the result of the hostilities between them in every age has proved incontestably the impossibility for either country to crush and subdue its opponent.

The victory of Agincourt was followed by the treaty of Troyes and the elevation of an English prince (Henry VI., a minor) to the throne of France, the Duke of Bedford acting as regent. This triumph, achieved after ninety-five years' fighting, seemed to realise for a time the dream of Edward III.; but it was exceedingly short-lived—the power of the English being overturned by a poor enthusiast, Joan of Arc, who imagined that she was inspired of heaven to avenge the miseries of her native land. Her enthusiasm having aroused the patriotic ardour of her countrymen, and, at the same time, impressed the English soldiery with fear, the result was the expulsion of the English from France, though Joan herself fell into the hands of her enemies, by whom, with the characteristic enlightenment of the age, she was cruelly burnt at the stake. The English now retired finally from France; but, with a persistence that aggravated the bitterness already existing between the two countries, the title of “King of France” was retained by the King of England till the time of George III. Among the lessons that

the French learnt from the English in these wars was the use of archery, which at this period was little known except in England. Edward III. is also said to have used fire-arms for the first time in the battle of Cressy, the same being then unknown in France, though they had been in use from an earlier time in Spain, where both Moors and Christians made use of gunpowder, the knowledge of which the former had brought with them from the East.

During the wars with the English—a short time after the battle of Poitiers—the misery of France was heightened by a rising of the mob, called the *Jacquerie*—the first popular revolt in the country mentioned in history. For a long time the peasants had groaned under the oppressions of their masters, and latterly had also ceased to be protected by them. They now rose *en masse* to avenge their wrongs, with the cry of “Death to gentlemen!” The castles of the nobles and gentry were set on fire and levelled with the ground; their wives and daughters were ravished and murdered; the nobles themselves were slain under exquisite torments, one of them being roasted before the eyes of his family, who were pressed to partake of the roast. “Saracen or Christian,” says Froissart, “never committed such iniquities.” Frenchmen alone were capable of them, whether in the age referred to or in later times; the horrid and the barbarous make up the natural elements of the French mob. The nobles at length collected together for mutual defence. Ten thousand of the mob were destroyed by the Duke of Orleans; twelve thousand by the King of Navarre. But there were nine thousand more at Meaux, which they had invested owing to the consort of the Dauphin and several other ladies of quality having betaken themselves thither as to a place of safety.

The age of Chivalry had not yet passed by, and knights and nobles from all directions eagerly flew to the rescue of the trembling dames. Their gallantry was successful; the peasants were routed with cruel slaughter—their insurrection drowned in blood: and this has always been the characteristic feature of civil dissensions in the country.

The evils of the feudal system in France were very early developed, and converted her into a mere knot of disjointed feudatories and duchies—such as Guienne, Flanders, Gascony, Toulouse, Burgundy, Vermandois, Bourbon, Normandy, and Bretagne—to fuse which together into one integral dominion taxed for many years all the energies of some of her greatest sovereigns. Louis XI., though individually contemptible, distinguished himself greatly in this work, and was rewarded with much deserved popularity for his resolute opposition of the barons. To avert the danger which threatened them, the great feudal lords formed themselves into a league, which was pompously called the “League for the public good;” and, selecting Charles of Burgundy as their leader, they defeated the king at the battle of Montlhery. But the death of Charles shortly after, in a war with the Swiss, threw all the advantage again into the hands of the king; and the resistance of the barons being now circumvented with greater ease, a deathblow was given to the feudal system, which died out in France at about the same time that it expired in England. Of the great fiefs, Normandy was broken into subjection, while Burgundy, Bourbon, and Bretagne were annexed, the last in the reign of Francis I., by whom it was acquired by right of his wife, and merged in the Crown. At a later date, in the reign of Louis XIII., the work of finally crushing the

nobility into subjection and establishing an irresponsible sovereignty, was carried out by Richelieu, who broke down the fabric of provincial feudalism by encouraging the residence of the barons in Paris in extravagance and luxury. He personally gave them an example of costly and luxurious living; the bait was eagerly caught; and they soon lost not only their provincial character, but also the means which had supported their power, and so ceased to give trouble to the Crown.

The breaking-up of feudalism and personal service led to the organisation of armies regularly maintained and paid, and this placed the king and his people altogether in a new relationship with each other. The tide of absolute power now set in with great strength in all places, and nowhere in greater strength than in France, where the authority of the sovereign became positively unrestricted. The task of domestic pacification was easily completed; the king, at the head of an army all his own, was soon everywhere hailed as the father of his people; and he was thus enabled to plan new acquisitions and distant conquests. The attention of Louis XII. was entirely engrossed by the affairs of Italy, and the whole reign of Francis I. was a contest for supremacy with Charles V. of Germany. The contention of Francis and Charles was particularly significant. They had both aspired to the emperorship of Germany, and professed, at least at the outset, to carry on their rivalry with emulation, not enmity—Francis, with a natural suavity of manner, describing it as a competition for the hand of the same mistress, which the more fortunate lover only could win, but the loss of which the rejected lover was not at liberty to resent. The success of Charles gave rise to different feelings. An endeavour was made by an

alliance with Henry VIII. of England to balance the power of Charles; but this led to nothing beyond a meeting between the two kings at a spot near Calais, which, from the splendour of the two Courts, was called "the field of the cloth of gold;" while Charles forestalled Francis by seeing Henry previously at Canterbury, and by securing the good offices of his minister Wolsey by a promise of the papacy. In the wars that followed, fortune, as Francis complained indignantly, failed him. His great general, Bayard, was killed, and he himself became a prisoner after his defeat at Pavia, when he wrote to his mother—"All except honour is lost." That also was lost soon after; he was liberated on conditions which were never fulfilled. But he suffered more deceptions from Charles than he practised on him: and thus they struggled on, neither gaining any material advantage over the other; Charles being barely able to maintain his supremacy in countries of which the population repudiated France, while Francis, obliged to abandon Italy and the suzerainty over Flanders, received nothing to counterbalance his loss.

The era of Francis was that in which the Middle Ages expired, and his endeavours to patronise and foster literature and the arts were well sustained. But, on the other hand, he set his face against the Reformation of Religion, which was spreading rapidly in Germany and England; and his cruelties to the professors of the reformed doctrines, especially to the Waldenses of Piedmont, threw France an age behind the times. Providence was not opposed to the development of great things in France; but France herself was not true to the destiny designed for her, and even Providence exerted itself on her behalf in vain. In the reign of Louis VIII. the Albigeois of

Languedoc anticipated the reformation of Luther, but were hunted to death for the open profession of their heretical opinions, many thousands of them being destroyed by the sword. To despatch and root out the rest with celerity the Holy Inquisition was established, and conducted by the monks of the order of St. Dominick with an atrocity, deceit, and cruelty that has never been surpassed even in barbarous and pagan lands. In the reign of Francis the persecutions were on the same scale, and some three thousand persons were massacred for adhering to their religious belief. Notwithstanding such treatment, the Protestant religion made much progress in the country during the three succeeding reigns, and many illustrious converts were made, among whom were the king of Navarre, a principality between France and Spain, the Prince of Condé, and Admiral Coligny; but this only plunged France deeper in sanguinary excess. Her fury culminated in the massacre of St. Bartholomew and the assassinations of Blois, when the atrocities of 1792 were more than anticipated. Up to this time England and France had been running the race of civilisation and enlightenment together. It was now that France fell back, while England pressed forward under Henry VIII. and Elizabeth. The persecutions in France repressed free and enlightened inquiry; they did more, for they implanted those seeds of political convulsions which attained such luxuriant growth in subsequent years.

The wars commenced by Francis I. were continued by his successor Henry II., the object held in view being the same. The Rhine border has been the hobby of France from the earliest times, the idea entertained being that the natural boundary of France on the east is the Rhine from its mouth to its source, and thence along the

crest of the Alps to the Mediterranean. For the realisation of this idea Henry II., who was persecuting his own Protestant subjects, undertook to defend those of Germany against their emperor, and with their connivance occupied by treachery Toul, Verdun, and Metz, which at the end of the war he was allowed by the peace of Château Cambresis to retain, to be fought for over and over, as they have been in later days. In the meantime the flames of civil war kindled by religious rancour blazed high, and the confusion was increased by the thunders of the Pope launched on the heads of those who had presumed to arm themselves against the Crown.

The assassination of Henry III. brought forward a turning-point in the history of France. Was France now to have a Catholic or a Protestant king? Henry of Navarre, the nearest male heir, was a heretic. His claim to the throne was therefore contested by Phillip II. of Spain, the son of the Emperor Charles V. The difficulty was got over by Henry agreeing to sink his religious convictions in deference to the wishes of his Catholic subjects, which at once put an end to a desolating war, and transferred the sceptre from the house of Valois to that of Bourbon. Henry did not, however, desert the interests of his Protestant subjects, though he compounded his own conscience for the throne. He became a convert to Catholicism with the settled purpose of thereby establishing toleration in religion at least throughout the country; and by the Edict of Nantes he secured to his Protestant subjects the free exercise of their religion, and an eligibility to all offices of the State. The other benefits conferred on the country by him were equally great. At his accession to the throne the kingdom was disunited; he succeeded in cementing the provinces together by his

policy : the nobles, who were haughty and discontented, were humbled by his valour ; the people, who were clamorous and oppressed, were conciliated and relieved. With the assistance of his minister, Sully, he was the first to introduce order into the finances, and discipline into the armies of France ; new manufactories were established by him, and new colonies planted ; and, while he restored peace and plenty at home, he rendered his kingdom great and formidable abroad. The power of Spain was checked by him ; and he meditated designs against Austria with a view to prevent her finally from disturbing the peace of Europe, when the life of one of the best sovereigns France ever had was cut short by the hand of an assassin.

The reign of his successor, Louis XIII., was famous for the vigorous administration of his minister Richelieu, who, like several other of the greatest ministers of France, was drawn from the cloister, and exchanged the crosier for the seals. The war with the Huguenots was reopened by him, but immediately after he supported the Protestant cause in Sweden and Holland to secure possession of the country between Champagne and the Rhine. He quarrelled also with England, Spain, Italy, and Austria ; his principle being the same with that adopted after him by Napoleon I., that no country could be great that was not actively engaged in successful war. The people he compared to mules, who were not to be left too much at their ease ; the nobles, if not serviceable in war, were held to be utterly useless, and deserving to be reduced to the rank of the mules : and he humbled both at the same time that he established discipline and order among them. But the success of his arms and projects brought no real strength to France ; freedom, which is the life of a people,

was crushed out by him ; and all his exertions only paved the way for that absolute despotism which was attained in the reign of Louis XIV.

The minority of Louis XIV. was distracted by a contest for the office of minister between two cardinals, Mazarin and De Retz, in which the former triumphed. The early part of this reign was also distinguished by civil wars, known as the “ Wars of the *Fronde*,” waged against the government by certain princes and nobles who felt aggrieved at their exclusion from high offices. The contest was carried on with the Frenchman’s characteristic levity ; the erection of barricades in the streets was diversified with fun and laughter ; the partisans changed sides constantly, till a formal pacification took place, upon which the *Fronde* was dissolved.

After arriving at maturity, Louis assumed the reins of government himself, and established a pure despotism, to which the nation cheerfully submitted. In Languedoc, very tyrannical measures were taken by him for exterminating the enemies of the Church, as many as ten thousand persons being put to death with cruel tortures—an operation which obtained the name of *Dragonnades*, from being carried out by dragoons. The Edict of Nantes was also revoked, which forced four hundred thousand Protestants to quit France for Britain, Holland, Prussia, Switzerland, and America. The loss to France was immense ; the gain to the countries to which they went was not less, as the exiles carried with them a knowledge of silk-spinning and weaving, dyeing, crystal-glass making, painting, and watch-making, along with general refinement and intelligence. Another oppression exercised was the issue of *Lettres de Cachet*, or sealed warrants, of which not less than nine thousand were

enforced by the sudden custody of those against whom they were directed, they being kept in the Bastille for years or for life, without trial of any sort in any court of justice. The "Man with the iron mask," of whom so much has been written, was a prisoner of this reign, he having been, as the plenipotentiary of a sovereign prince (the Duke of Mantua), removed from prison to prison with a mask on his face to prevent his being recognised. He was thus kept in durance for twenty-four years, after which he died and was buried in the Bastille, all vestiges of his existence being removed. That this was possible in France at the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century, is a sad commentary on the character of her people.

With oppressions of this nature every vestige of political independence was swept away. The assemblies of the States-General, a recognised institution since the days of Philip *le Bel* (1302), in which the *Tiers État*, or third estate, met together with the nobles and the clergy, were no longer held; the municipal corporations established since the time of Louis IX. (St. Louis) were now nominated by the Court; the several districts of the empire were placed under the control of Intendants; the Parliament of Paris was silenced whip in hand, and directed to mind its own business, and not to interfere with the ordinances of the king; and even the courts of justice were dictated to and interfered with at the pleasure of the Crown. The French people submitted to all this very quietly: the Court was maintained with great splendour; the attractions of Paris were augmented by the erection of many fine buildings; luxury and taste were cultivated even in the matter of powdered periwigs and ornamental snuff-boxes; learned societies were also established for assisting in the spread

of education ; and people readily acknowledged that the title of *Grande Monarque*, assumed by the king, was well earned.

Externally, a career of aggression was adopted which aspired to the elevation of France by the depression of other countries, and which at one time promised to make Louis master of all Europe. He had brave and experienced generals to fight for him in Condé, Turenne, Luxembourg, Villars, Vauban, and others, and for some time their arms were everywhere crowned with success ; but united against him in self-defence were all the great powers of the day—England, Holland, Spain, Germany, and the greatest part of Italy ; and the series of victories gained by Marlborough at Blenheim, Ramillies, Oudenarde, and Malplaquet, soon turned the tide in favour of the allies, and led to the peace of Utrecht, the Frenchmen receiving the drubbing given to them with their usual lightheartedness, and consoling themselves with epigrams and satirical songs deriding their enemies. Has not this ever been the distinguishing feature of the nation ? The Ethiopian may change his skin, the leopard his spots ; the Frenchman his character, never. The result of all these wars was that, at the death of Louis XIV., France was politically and physically prostrate, with her resources exhausted, her trade ruined, her towns depopulated, even her military fame tarnished ; and yet, such was the infatuation of the people that they remained dazzled by the spurious lustre of his reign to the last. No one monarch ever did more harm to an entire nation than he did, either before or after him.

Apart from the wars which disfigured it, the age of Louis XIV. will be remembered as the Augustan age of France—the age of Pascal, Des Cartes, Corneille, Racine,

Molière, Bossuet, Flechier, Massillon, Fenelon, Fontaine, Rochefoucauld, Bayle, and Le Sage. But what shall we say of the taste of a monarch who banished Fenelon from his Court for having written *Telemachus*, which he understood to be a satire on himself? He appreciated nothing but adulation and flattery; and the learned societies which were founded by Richelieu, Mazarin, and Colbert, were filled by him with men best able to give a gloss to the profligacy of his Court. But it is said of him that he patronised the arts and sciences with a liberal hand; the painter, the sculptor, and the architect were well befriended by him. One other great act of his reign will also be remembered; he gave a most kind and generous reception to James II. of England in his adversity, when he was obliged to run away from his throne.

Louis XIV. was succeeded by his great-grandson, Louis XV. The minority of the latter was disturbed by the intrigues and ambition of the Spanish Court, which did not terminate till the fall of Alberoni, in 1719. The administration of Cardinal Fleury, as prime-minister of France, was successful; but after the cardinal's death the king was swayed entirely by his mistresses, Madame Pompadour and others, who seriously imperilled the interests of the State. In this reign France and England were again opposed in the wars for the Austrian Succession, and the Duke of Cumberland was signally defeated by Marshal Saxe at the battles of Fontenoy and Laupfelt. The English were more successful in the Seven Years' War which followed, and inflicted great territorial losses on France which she was never able to recover. In Europe, the French were defeated at Minden; in America at Quebec, which resulted in Canada being wrested from them; and in India they sustained a series of defeats

which, by shrivelling up their power there, developed that of Britain. Both in the East and the West the chances of France becoming the ascendant power were for many years much greater than those of England. France never wanted heroes at either place to uphold her fame; but, unfortunately, the French are never able to endure reverses, and always sink under them, while Britain as invariably rises greater from her defeats. It was only the want of stamina in the national character that lost to France all her foreign possessions, which once lost were never regained.

The age of Louis XV. was the age of Montesquieu, Rousseau, Voltaire, Buffon, Raynal, Rollin, Marmontel, Diderot, and D'Alembert; so that, so far as literary pre-eminence was concerned, the period was nearly as brilliant as the one that had preceded it. Unfortunately, the staff of authors named comprised some powerful and intolerant writers who upheld novel doctrines in philosophy and morals, and treated all questions of political life with freedom bordering on mockery. This unsettled the minds of those who depended on them for instruction, and paved the way for the convulsions which followed a short while after. It is true that the people who caused those convulsions could not read books, but it is also true that they did manage to acquire the sentiments expressed in them and their irreverent *persiflage* at second-hand. The great revolutionary classes were the artisans—not the peasantry. The former learn things more easily than the latter, and observe distinctions more narrowly. Smarting under their own degradation and poverty, they compared it with the effeminate splendour of the higher classes around them. They also saw and felt that the burden imposed on the nation by the wars and expenses of the

last two reigns had been unequally distributed, the main portion of taxation to meet it having been imposed on the labouring classes, while the higher classes were allowed to go free. With this knowledge they were now taught to deride the men and institutions whom they had hitherto regarded with respect; and the idea of "Liberty, equality, and fraternity" was thus in a manner forced upon them. The different classes of the community were violently separated from each other. The higher classes laughed at the aspirations of the mob, and at the same time waged war among themselves, the ancient nobility looking down with contempt on the upstart class—the nobles of the robe, as they called them—of statesmen, lawyers, and magistrates, who had secured wealth, bought estates, and acquired patents of nobility. The unprivileged orders—the merchants, traders, and citizens—regarded all titled idlers with equal disgust, and were awaiting with savage impatience the hour for action. What spurred them on still more was the example of other nations before them. The expulsion of the Stuarts from the throne of England was yet fresh in their memory. After that the Americans had risen, and fought for and earned their independence. "What others dare, I dare too," was naturally the cry of the Frenchman. He remembered that he had assisted America in throwing off her yoke. Could he not fight as hard for his own rights? Thus did the storm gather that burst on the head of Louis XVI. Correctly has the Revolution been called a revolution of *ideas*. It was a war of the people against all rights operating against them. It warred against power, privilege, and customs, endangering even real rights and salutary institutions. But the motives were not the less pure because the issue was so unfortunate.

The tempest was foreseen some thirty or forty years before it burst forth, but no attempts were made to avert the approaching danger, because the governments of both Louis XV. and Louis XVI. were equally unfit to deal with the crisis. The latter worked on in its accustomed groove, lulled into a fatal security by its very imbecility. The public income having become inadequate to meet the wants of the State, and the Parliament of Paris having refused to sanction the imposition of further taxes, the States-General, or the assembly of the representatives of the three orders of nobility, church, and commons, was summoned by the king. The first resolution carried in the Assembly was that they would vote as one body, not as three distinct bodies, and this threw all the power into the hands of the commons, on account of their numerical superiority. Thus was the Revolution virtually commenced. The Assembly next proceeded to assert their independence, and many salutary innovations were made. The first scenes were confined to debates upon the declaration of the rights of the citizens, the forced abolition of all prerogatives and privileges, and the repression of all abuses, old and new. The rage for republican simplicity then gave way to an admiration for the English constitution; and, in imitation of it, France was declared to be a constitutional monarchy, with an Assembly to make laws, a limited right of veto being left to the king. But here the purity of the movement terminated: the wild and inflamed populace did not understand bare rights; the men who led them on did not seek for rights only. The provision of veto by the king displeased the mob; and on the 5th October, 1789, the insurrection broke out by beat of drum, the people shouting on all sides for bread. In the States-General the Jacobin faction, or violent

democrats, prevailed; and, while the mob committed the greatest barbarities in the streets, the Assembly backed them by abolishing the order of nobility, and by announcing that no man was to possess any distinction beyond that arising from his virtues. The terms *monsieur* and *madame* were discontinued; every man was a *citizen*, and every woman a *citoyenne*. The unmitigated barbarism that followed has never been equalled. A people justly proud of their philosophy, literature, and refinement at once became worse than American and Australian savages. The outrage culminated by the palace being attacked, upon which the royal family was consigned to prison.

The successful revolutionists now assembled under the name of the National Convention, the great leaders of which were Robespierre, Danton, Marat, St. Just, and Condorcet. The king was deposed, tried, condemned, and guillotined. France was well pleased, but all Europe was horrified and aghast. The case was not analogous to that of Charles I. of England, for Louis had done nothing to deserve his fate. Prussia had invaded France to prevent the crime, but was beaten back. War was at the same time declared against the other powers that had tried to interfere—namely, Austria, England, Spain, and Holland. The French were prepared to fight against all comers, and well were it if they had been prepared for that only. France was the country where Chivalry was born; France was also the country where Chivalry came first to be outraged and disowned. Not a spark of Chivalry was anywhere elicited when Marie Antoinette was carried to the place of execution. The ferocity of the hour triumphed over all kindly feelings; the queen suffered as her husband had done, her only crime that she was his

wife. These were followed by crowds of other victims, old and young, of both sexes, of every rank in life, who were all capriciously condemned and executed. This has well been named in history the "Reign of Terror," when the Jacobins had everything in their own way, till their virulence was exhausted on each other. It is said that Danton exclaimed in his last moments: "I see that in revolutions the greatest rascal lives last." He referred to Robespierre, who was guillotined in July, 1794.

The reign of terror was overturned by a second revolution, by which the constitution was reorganised, the government being lodged in two councils—namely, the Legislative Council consisting of five hundred members, and the Council of Elders consisting of two hundred and fifty members, by both of which the executive authority was assigned to a Directory of five members. The republican armies were everywhere successful; Holland was subdued, Spain and Prussia were compelled to make peace, and the general coalition against France was dissolved. But there were still enemies to fight with, in England, Austria, and Italy. The campaign in Italy brought the military genius of Bonaparte into prominence, and compelled Austria to make peace. Since the days of Louis XIV. the arms of France were never so triumphant as now; and, elated by their Italian victories, the Directory first formed the design of invading England, which was afterwards modified, at the suggestion of Napoleon, to an attack on Egypt as preparatory to the conquest of India. The battles of the Pyramids and of Mount Tabor seemed to facilitate this design, till the victory of Nelson over the French fleet at Aboukir Bay dispelled the illusion by cutting off the invading force from Europe.

The third revolution was effected by Bonaparte, who,

seeing that the game in Egypt was over, came back to France and dissolved the Directory, establishing in place of it a Senate and three Consuls, and becoming the First Consul himself. The ferocity of the first revolution had died out; people now sought protection from anarchy and violence; and all hailed with satisfaction a soldier at the head of the State, as able to afford the security that was required. The prestige of the French arms had at this time been well established. With imperfect means at her disposal, France had withstood a world in arms. She had acquired dominion in Italy, taken possession of Switzerland, made the Rhine her eastern boundary, and was mistress of Holland and Belgium. England, deserted by pusillanimous allies, had been compelled to take to the defensive. A coalition formed against her by the naval powers—France, Russia, and Denmark—she rendered abortive by destroying the Danish fleet. After that, she was once more able to turn the cards on France, and formed another coalition against her which was joined by Russia. Nor was this displeasing to Bonaparte, who was anxious for an opportunity to renew the glories of his Italian campaign. The battles of Marengo and Hohenlinden silenced Austria; but England was able to wrench Malta from the Consulate, being already supreme at sea. She was also able to defeat the French in Egypt, where Abercrombie gained the battle of Alexandria.

By the fourth revolution the First Consul became Emperor. The frenzy of "Liberty, equality, and fraternity" was now over; the dethronement and murder of a king and all the attendant horrors had passed for nought; within twelve years after everything was forgotten, and the nation quietly submitted to military despotism. The wars of the Empire are well known. Aided by generals

of real ability, with an army recruited by conscription to any desired amount, Napoleon indulged in dreams of universal conquest. One nation of all the European States, with Paris for the capital of the world, was the utopian idea uppermost in his mind, which he really believed it was his destiny to accomplish. The rapidity of his victories marked a new master in the art of war. Austria was repeatedly beaten, Prussia defeated and overrun, and Russia compelled to accept terms of peace. In Prussia it was the queen who incited the people to resistance; but the men were not equally high-spirited and resolute, and the defeats at Jena and Auerstadt led to the triumphal occupation of Berlin. Similarly, Austria, thrice beaten before, sustained a final defeat at Wagram, which led to the occupation of Vienna, loss of territory, and a crushing indemnity. The old German Empire was thus dissolved, and a union of sixteen princes was formed in lieu of it, and taken under the protecting wing of France. The subjection of England was now sedulously sought for, and Napoleon seriously contemplated invading her, and completed the preparations necessary for carrying out his design. But the fleet under Villeneuve, which was to have escorted the invader across the Channel, was intercepted by Nelson, and afterwards destroyed at Trafalgar, and thus was one favourite scheme of the *petit caporal* baffled for ever. He nevertheless continued to issue from Berlin decrees placing the British Isles in a state of blockade, without having ships wherewith to enforce his decrees; and it was afterwards a complaint against Spain and Portugal that they had disregarded these decrees, which led to the occupation of Spain by the French, and the elevation of a Bonaparte to the throne of that country. But the might of England was

thrown into the scale on the side of Spain, and, after a hard struggle, Napoleon was checkmated. It is curious that, notwithstanding his continuous triumph over every other power, his contentions with England were uniformly unfortunate. Whether in Egypt, Calabria, or Spain, the English were always able to resist him effectually, till he was finally overthrown by their "Sepoy-general," as Wellington was contemptuously called by him.

Napoleon was an autocrat ; but when that is said, all is said that can be said against him as a ruler. France was not then, is not now, fit for anything better than despotism ; and as a despot he ruled over her well. The country wanted a capacious mind and a strong hand, and he had both. His civil rule was faultless, and brought order out of chaos and confusion. His military genius did more harm ; but it was just the thing France appreciated, and it kept her in good humour long. His inordinate ambition was his only vice, and wrought his fall. His wish to invade Britain was childish, and it is more than probable that he was himself fully aware that he would never be able to carry out the idea. The invasion of Russia was another mistake. He was not able to conquer her, and came back, not humiliated only, but thoroughly beaten. He might have been a greater sovereign than Louis XIV. but for these fruitless attempts ; he can now be regarded only as akin to

"Macedonia's madman and the Swede."

One cause of the great popularity of his military expeditions was the amount of plunder they invariably brought to the country. For a number of years half the public expenditure was thus covered by war contributions, the

armies being supported, besides, at the cost of the countries they entered. Half the amount of taxation was thus saved, at the same time that the inebriation of military glory was deliciously enjoyed.

The retreat from Moscow dealt a severe blow ; but after it the French were yet able to win the battles of Lützen, Bautzen, and Dresden. The effect of these victories was, however, neutralised by the defeat at Leipsic, which enabled the Prussian and German forces to capture Paris, just when Soult was being driven out of Spain by the English. A power depending on one man personally has always a precarious tenure. There was no alternative now but for the victor of many battles to fly. A British ship conveyed him to Elba, and the fickle Frenchmen were not sorry that he was thus got rid of. But he turned up again a short time after, when the French of course veered round, or, at all events, the French generals and army received him back with enthusiasm. The hunters around him were also equally alert ; all the great powers promptly prepared for a final struggle.

Napoleon returned from Elba in March, 1815. On the 16th June he defeated the Prussians under Blücher, at Ligny. Two days after, the two greatest strategists of the age—the “Sepoy-general” and the *petit caporal*—were confronted on nearly equal terms, each at the head of an army of about seventy-five thousand men, on the field of Waterloo. The action was necessarily well contested ; but the issue was not doubtful when the Prussians appeared on the field, upon which the French were thoroughly routed. The power of Napoleon was now entirely prostrated, though, compared with more recent engagements, the battle of Waterloo was only a second-rate fight. France, which had hitherto been so faithful to her chief,

notwithstanding the whitening bones of her sons in Egypt, Russia, and on fifty battle-fields, now made a resolute stand against the call for more troops. Napoleon was obliged to abdicate. His subsequent attempt to embark for the United States was frustrated, and, at the desire of all the great powers, he was despatched to St. Helena, where he died. The treatment he met with was extraordinary, and not justified by any existing law. He was exiled for life simply as a disturber of the peace of Europe, by those who had him in their power. But there is no doubt that the punishment, legal or illegal, was well merited. It was in the power of Napoleon to have become a blessing to the country he ruled over; he had many of the qualities which make a great and useful sovereign: but he chose his part differently, and paid a suitable penalty for having done so.

The fifth revolution was that which restored the white cockade of the old monarchy, by raising Louis XVIII. to the throne on the retirement of Napoleon to Elba. The reign of the king was interrupted for a hundred days by the return of Napoleon in March, but was resumed after the battle of Waterloo. It was now that the French for the first time got a constitution which assimilated the government as much as possible to that of Britain, being comprised of a king with a responsible ministry, a chamber of peers nominated by the Crown, and a chamber of deputies elected by qualified voters. They also obtained freedom of the press within certain limitations, liberty of conscience, and equality of taxation. The reign of Charles X., who succeeded Louis, is memorable for the acquisition of Algiers, after the destruction of a nest of corsairs—the pests of the seas; but this only existing dependency of France has always been felt as a grievous burden. The

character of Charles was oppressive, and gave rise to a rebellion, or the sixth revolution, by which the king was deposed and banished, and his branch of the Bourbon family declared incapable of holding the throne, which brought forward the younger, or Orleans branch, and placed Louis Philippe on the throne.

A general summary of the Orleans rule is that it was beyond example expensive to the people, and that it did not altogether recognise the public weal as the object of government. On the other hand, a state of peace permitted the development of the resources of the country, and many internal improvements were made. But the king was not liked; and there was a party in existence with strong democratic tendencies. The cry on all sides now was for more freedom, and for unrestricted discussion on political and religious subjects. The French have never understood constitutional agitation; an easily-excited populace was quickly carried beyond the bounds of discretion. This inaugurated the seventh revolution: the streets of Paris were barricaded; the king being dethroned escaped with difficulty to England, and a republic was set up.

The republic established was soon endangered by the outbreak of social barbarism, very similar to that which had disgraced France from 1792 to 1795. The name of Bonaparte had intermediately fallen into a species of oblivion, but, after the death of the Duke of Reichstadt in 1832, was revived in Louis Napoleon, who now came forward to the rescue of France, and was unanimously elected President, in 1848. An eighth revolution dissolved the republic—the people, who were labouring under apprehensions of falling again under the rule of the Parisian rabble, gladly accepting in place of it an

arbitrary government, which promised at least to suffer them to live in peace and security. The President now assumed the name of Dictator. He was assisted by a Council of State, a Senate, and a Legislative Council; but in everything he had his own way and wielded absolute authority, and shortly after he was chosen Emperor.

The second empire was in all material points of good government a failure. It suppressed liberty, impeded thought, and was responsible for the most fatal of modern wars, under which France fell without an effort and a friend. But still it gave what the Frenchman wanted—protection from revolutions, and a fixity of administration. A secure government is France's greatest need; she cannot afford to be governed by roughs, to be in constant danger of disturbing innovations. This was well understood by Napoleon III., and his particular anxiety to found a dynasty made him especially quiet and circumspect; and considerable national progress was made during his reign, and many new industries were developed. The best service he did to France was to set at rest the national antipathy against England; he went so far as to establish an alliance between the two countries, and even to exchange a treaty of commerce; and his rule might have been more successful than it turned out in the sequel, if the French character had been more robust.

The rock on which he stumbled was the Frenchman's vanity, which has never been equalled. Since the epoch of Richelieu and Louis XIV. France had been accustomed to play the first rôle among European nations, and in this claim she was strengthened by the achievements of Napoleon I. The claim was based on her strong politico-

military organisation, and still more on the classical literature which in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries had grown up in the country, and had made her language and culture supreme in Europe. This pre-eminence France had paraded at all times, and all her sovereigns had always found it convenient to pamper the frailty. Napoleon's reign would not have been worth an hour's purchase if he had adopted a different course. The dance round the golden calf—differently called "glory," "fame," and "*éclat*"—was the tenure on which he held the throne; and the dance-master had no alternative but to lead on the dance. There was first the Crimean war, in which Napoleon proved to the satisfaction of his people that they were in all respects superior, not only to their opponents the Russians, but also to their allies the English—a pleasing assurance, which kept the Frenchmen satisfied for a time. Next came on the war for the union of Italy, in which Napoleon assisted, not for the sake of the object, which he did not care for, but as a quixotic folly that would divert his people in the manner they wished to be played with. Lombardy and the Duchies were wrested from Austria and transferred to Piedmont. This in itself was a great thing for the Frenchman, for it raised him in renown. To humour him yet further, Nice and Savoy were annexed, a rectification of the frontier of France which puffed him up with pride. The emperor's next undertaking, the Mexican war, was a blunder, and ended in misfortune; the Reds looked sour over it, and the nation was discontented. The bold showman had now to make up for the mischance of the game, and retrieve his laurels. He turned his eyes wistfully towards the eastern frontier of France, on which ages of aspirations

were based. Since the reconstruction of Germany, after the overthrow of the first empire, war between the two countries had been but a question of time. It had been deferred because the unity of Germany had not yet been fully accomplished, all that the war of liberation (1813-14) had effected being the restoration of a motley group of independent States. The success of Prussia at Sadowa changed the position of affairs by realising at last the idea of a united Germany. But, instead of going to war with a powerful State about it, Napoleon preferred the safer course of claiming black-mail for having kept the peace. Prussia, however, refused to yield one inch of German soil. Even if Napoleon had wished to keep the peace with her after that he could not have done so, for all France—the army, and after it the people—refused to accept the position of a rivalry with Prussia, as head of the Germanic confederation, on equal terms. This was the real cause of the Franco-German war; France fought solely for the championship of Europe. Prussia had long foreseen the contingencies likely to arise, and was armed to the teeth; but she knew how to wait and when to strike. The overweening confidence of France made her less wary. A mere pretext for war was found and taken advantage of with an impertinence and levity of which France alone was capable, and with an inexcusable ignorance of the actual strength of Prussia. The ready hand of the gauntleted Teuton gave back the blow with tremendous effect. After the humiliating defeats which were sustained, the whole blame of the war was attempted to be cast on Napoleon III., who, as dancing-master to the nation, was doubtless to blame, but whose office made it obligatory on him to keep up the dance the nation wanted. It was also attempted to throw the responsibility

of the war on Prussia, which, it was alleged, had secretly armed for the purpose. But the real responsibility rested with France alone, which had made no secret of her wish to resume the Rhine boundary at fitting time, and had thus forced the Prussians to be prepared for the occasion. French vanity now required a sacrifice, and Napoleon III. was deposed. The only thing that could save the country, it was thought, was a republic, for which among the populace there was a clamorous demand. This led to her present provisional form of government. It is hard to say where France will land at last.

The Germans, constrained to defend themselves, did so with hearty good-will. The self-importance of the French received a terrible rebuff. All Europe had reckoned that there would be a great and formidable rising of the nation after its first reverses, but there was nothing approaching to it. The beating was received more quietly than it would have been, perhaps, by any other people in Europe. It was now Germany's turn to claim territorial compensation, and she did so ; but what she did claim was not French but German ground, long separated from Germany, but the restoration of which at this juncture was nothing but an act of political justice. It was not, however, as an act of political justice only that it was claimed ; it was claimed as an act of political necessity, to render it impossible for France to retaliate, to make the last act the very last. As Carlyle puts it, in his own quaint manner, "France has got her first lesson, and well will it be if she can learn her lesson honestly. If she cannot, she will get another, and even another : learnt the lesson must be." For her present position France has none to blame but herself.

The government of France, call it by what name you

please, has never been anything but a species of despotism. It is true that the nation has awakened at intervals to a consciousness of its position, and strongly asserted its rights. But the vigour thus displayed was never abiding; and, if it succeeded at times in securing the blessings of equal laws, equal taxation, and the recognition of individual rights, those blessings were surrendered again without hesitation at the shrine of absolute power—either in the shape of a monarchy or of a democracy—for the fancied prizes of greatness and glory, which the national mind has, in all ages, so devoutly worshipped, such greatness and glory being better prized than half-developed rights and privileges. It is not that the Frenchman does not wish for or appreciate social privileges to the same extent as they are appreciated in other countries. He does want them, and he does appreciate them: but he aspires at perfection in everything; he will not have any privileges in an imperfect state of development,—in such a state as the Briton and the American would, for the time, be satisfied with. He worships the ideal in everything, and anything short of the ideal appears to him scarcely worth having. He calls the revolutions “glorious,” notwithstanding the atrocities connected with them, because of the ideal that was attempted to be secured by them. He will not come down from that elevation of thought to the actual realities of existence. He still believes that his ideal is attainable, that the classes which stand lowest in the social scale, can, and will, be brought to an absolute equality with the higher and educated classes. For such a nation there is no position between despotism and revolution.

The distinguishing traits of the French character are

impulsiveness, novelty, vanity, fickleness, and a deficiency of the reflective and moral faculties. The upper classes are more vicious and more extravagant than in other countries; but the middle and lower classes are not so. There is, in ordinary times at least, less drunkenness and brutality among these classes than among their like in other places; and the constantly accumulating wealth of France is the best proof of the industry and frugality of her people. In the contest for superiority in manufactures, arts, and learning, France has been more than a match for Germany, and quite a match even for England. There is no literature so rich as that of France; and the arts and sciences claim a long list of renowned Frenchmen among their best exponents. As in England, however, there has been a decline in the educational standard in recent years, markedly since the first revolution, and, barring noticeable exceptions, the rage now is for frivolous and undignified mediocrity. The greatest superiority of France over other countries is in her refinement and civilisation, in both of which the post of honour is still her own.

CHAPTER VI.

GERMANY.

THOSE who are familiar with the pages of Gibbon will not require any detailed description of the state of Germany prior to the dissolution of the Roman Empire. It will be enough to state that the country so named, from which all the civilised nations of modern Europe trace their descent, was anciently inhabited by a race of hardy barbarians, differently named in different places, but all classed under the general designation of Goths, who, when they united for a common purpose, assumed the name of Alemanni or Germanen, from which that of Germany was derived. They were distinguished by their huge stature, fair complexion, and light-blue eyes, the several subdivisions of the race being variously known as Ostrogoths, Visigoths, Suevi, Gepidæ, Marcomanni, etc., with outlying tribes called Saxons, Franks, and Burgundians. Some authorities make out that all these nations came originally from Asia, probably from the east of the Caspian; while others, with greater reason, assert that they were born in the forests of Germany, whence they migrated eastwards, but were again brought back by the rushing hordes that burst upon Europe from Tartary. They were not all of them savages, but the tribes who pressed on them from the East—the Huns, Alans, Bulgars, etc.—were. Of the German tribes it is said that they had all the virtues of

which barbarians are susceptible : the men being valiant, courteous, and hospitable, and the women chaste, meriting the confidence and esteem in which they were generally held. On the other hand, all the tribes were fierce, easily provoked, and always at war, though what they were principally distinguished for was their unconquerable love of liberty, the authority of kings being acknowledged by certain tribes only, while all reserved to themselves the rights of men. The bravest warriors were selected to lead their respective clans in time of war ; and, similarly, princes were chosen in time of peace to administer justice and settle differences among them : but neither leader nor prince had the power to punish with death, to imprison, or to strike.

It has been stated in the last chapter how, on the disruption of the Roman Empire, the Franks and Burgundians passed over into Gaul and occupied it. Simultaneously with that movement, the Visigoths passed into Spain and Italy, and the Saxons into Britain, while the remaining races, including such of the Franks and Saxons as were left behind, settled themselves in Germany, or the country contained within the Rhine, the Baltic, the Vistula, the northern mountains of Bohemia, and the river Maine. Christianity was established among these chiefly by Anglo-Saxon missionaries, of whom Winifred was the first ; so that the debt which England owed Germany for stocking her with the Anglo-Saxon race was, even at this early period, fully repaid. Then followed the conquests of Charles Martel, when each rude tribe, as it was subjugated, was invited to receive the religion of Rome, so that the sword and the Gospel went hand in hand in Germany, as the sword and the Korán had done previously in Asia, though not exactly in the same

sense. The Anglo-Saxon missionaries also collected the people into towns, and introduced the elements of civilisation among them, and they founded those monasteries which became asylums of peace during the violent convulsions that disturbed the country throughout the Middle Ages.

In the eighth century, the Franks, having become a great power under Charlemagne, were able to bring the races of Germany under subjection, the only people who gave them trouble being the Saxon remnants who had not been converted, who were not overcome till after a long and bloody war. The empire of Charlemagne was thus extended from the Ebro to the Elbe, and from the ocean to the Vistula, the Theiss, and the Save. Intermediately, the Papal See had found means to secure a jurisdiction, both temporal and spiritual, over the defunct empire of the West; and, being sorely troubled by the Lombards, who had established themselves in Italy, Adrian I. applied to Charlemagne for aid against them, upon which Lombardy was conquered and Charlemagne crowned king of Italy. After this, the Pope, to secure continued protection from the conqueror, declared him Emperor, reviving the Western Empire; and it was agreed between them that the Pontiff should reside at Rome, and the temporal Cæsar beyond the Alps—nearer to the centre of his territories. From this time till the reign of Charles the Simple, the affairs of Germany are interwoven with those of France, and the history of the two countries is necessarily the same. The succession to the empire being destined by Charlemagne for his son, he made him king of Italy to begin with, upon which that appellation became equivalent to the old designation of Cæsar; and, as many emperors contented themselves with the lower title

till they were actually crowned at Rome, the inference was established that the sovereign was not qualified to act as emperor till after his consecration by the Pope. Adrian IV., in writing to Frederick Barbarossa on the subject, laid down the premises in the following words: "The Roman Empire was translated from the Greeks to the Germans; but the king of the Teutons was not called emperor before he was crowned by the Apostolic power. Before his consecration he was king; after it he became emperor. Of whom, then, but of us, doth he hold the empire? From the election of his own princes he enjoys the name of king; from our consecration he derives the appellation of emperor, Augustus, and Cæsar; therefore through us he governs. . . . Whatever he hath as emperor, he hath from us; for, as Zacharias transferred the empire from the Greeks to the Germans, so can we transfer it from the Germans to the Greeks."

The successors of Charlemagne possessed the empire by hereditary right, and exercised full regal powers, as he had done, throughout the entire extent of their dominions. But the effeminacy of some of the rulers disgusted the Germans, and when the Normans were bought off by the French, the provocation became insufferable, and the principal nations of Germany—the Franks, Suabians, Bavarians, Saxons, and Thuringians—assembled in full diet and elected a separate emperor for themselves. The crown of Germany was from this time parted for ever from that of France. The French policy of hereditary succession was at the same time overthrown,—the dukes, margraves, and counts of the empire, with the archbishops, bishops, and abbots, constituting themselves the legitimate electors of the chief by whom they would be governed. The succession thus became elective, though,

as a rule, a member of the reigning house was generally chosen. In time the electors and princes insensibly acquired rights and ruling privileges within their estates, by which the whole country was divided into independent principalities, and this left to the emperors a general supremacy only, which, being indefinite, varied according to the vigour of the arm by which it was swayed.

The first chief selected by the Germans was Arnulf, Duke of Carinthia; but he died shortly after, upon which Conrad was elected, and founded the house of Saxony. The main divisions of German society at this time were four—namely, (1) the slaves, (2) the freedmen, (3) the freemen, and (4) the nobles. The first comprised the captives taken in war, all debtors unable to meet their engagements, and convicted criminals. Several of these were allowed to purchase their emancipation with the produce of their labour, and these were known as freedmen. The warriors were all freemen; and the princes, dukes, and counts they served were the nobles, who held their estates under the feudal system on the obligation of service, with an interminable system of subdivisions under them, by which the number of proprietors was immensely multiplied, and their reciprocal relations made exceedingly complicated. One thing was clearly understood, that every freeman was bound to follow the banner of his local chief wherever it might lead to, and this necessarily placed a large amount of authority in the hands of the greater chiefs, and made them virtually independent. The bolder warriors were thus enabled to assume extensive powers, and often to commit great crimes, which gave rise to much internal disorder, at the same time that externally the nation was perpetually harassed by the Slavs from one side and the Huns from another.

The first sovereign who consolidated the empire was Henry, surnamed the Fowler, so called from his having been much addicted to the pursuit of birds, in which amusement he was actually engaged when he received the news of his elevation. His success was owing, not only to the prowess of his arms, which was great, but also to his readiness at conciliation, by which he reconciled several of his enemies, including the dukes of Suabia and Bavaria, to his rule. He also induced the Duke of Lorraine to join the Germanic confederation, prevailing on Charles the Simple of France to renounce his claims on the province and allow it to secede. He at the same time beat back the Huns, to whom it had hitherto been customary to pay black-mail, which he refused; was the first in Germany to surround open towns and villages with ditches and walls for their protection; established the march of Meissen against the Slavs; and encouraged industry and arts of every description. The reign of his successor, Otho the Great, was equally successful, Italy being reduced by him and added to the empire, while several victories were won over the Slavs, Danes, and Huns, the defeat of the last people enabling him further to consolidate the margravate of Austria. What the reign of Otho was, however, principally famous for, was his quarrel with Pope John, whom he deposed, setting up Leo VIII. in his place, whereby the right of the emperor to nominate the Pope was originated. Even before this time the rival pretensions of the Empire and the Papal See had, from the time of the Carlovingsians, often disturbed the public tranquillity. It became worse now. The great Charlemagne had received regal consecration at the hands of the spiritual Cæsar, and the Popes had based on that the principle that the blessing

of the Church was necessary to the assumption of the imperial title. A corresponding privilege as regards the election of the Pope came henceforth to be claimed by the emperors, and the quarrels which arose from the arrogation of these different rights were incessant.

The Saxon dynasty ended with the reign of Henry II., who abstained from the bed of his wife, and left no heir. A great part of the time of this prince was taken up by the disturbances created by the dukes, and their military dependants, the counts and barons, who in Germany very early assumed the character of bandits, and perpetrated acts of violence which even bandits would have blushed at. The reason for this apparently was the rapid deterioration of the national character, which, though still as pugnacious as before, had almost forgotten its original impassioned love of liberty, and now asserted the rights of manhood only by an excess in eating, drinking, and debauchery. Notwithstanding this drawback, however, considerable consolidation was received by the empire during the Saxon period, and several new margravates were added, in the same manner as the Americans add new States to their Union. The position of the empire was, by these means, raised in the scale of nations, and even the proud Cæsars of the East were induced to ally themselves by marriage with the Cæsars of the West.

The Franconian dynasty was commenced in 1024, by the election of Conrad II., a nobleman of Franconia, in whose time Burgundy was annexed. The greatest king of the line was Henry IV.; but his reign was rendered unhappy and unprofitable by fresh discords with the Pope. On the one side, the Papal See aspired to a temporal as well as a spiritual supremacy over Germany,

which Henry would not allow; on the other, the emperor assumed a right of investing bishops with the crosier and the ring in token of their submission to him, which the Pope violently opposed. The emperor deposed the Pope and committed great disorders in the Pontifical States. The Pope obtained greater advantages by deposing and excommunicating the emperor, which raised his own sons and subjects against him. After a twenty years' war, in which he fought sixty battles, the emperor was barely able to pacify the empire and subdue his eldest son. But the success was momentary, as his second son rebelled immediately after, and wresting the sceptre from him, reduced him to such straits that in his last days he wanted even the necessaries of life. The private life of the emperor was execrable; his licentious amours dishonoured the noblest families: nay, he did not even spare his own, for it is said that he violated his sister, and made one of his sons defile his step-mother's bed. But in all other respects he was a great king, who met the difficulties of his position with singular energy and firmness.

From this time to the reign of Rodolph I. the history of Germany is principally remarkable for a continuous struggle of two centuries between the emperors and the Popes, the papal power having now risen to its greatest height. Henry V. endeavoured to settle all differences forcibly by capturing the Pope; but, after the death of his captive—Pascal—Calixtus II., though a relative of the emperor, pressed on him with greater pertinacity, revived the excommunication against him, and obliged him to effect a compromise, whereby he renounced the right of investing bishops with the emblems of their pastoral duty, the ring and the crosier, and only retained

the right of conferring temporalities on them by the emblem of the sceptre. In the reign of Lothario, the Saxon, still farther concessions had to be made, and the emperor gave up his right to be present at ecclesiastical elections, the homage of the bishops to him being changed to a vain oath of fidelity and obedience. In other respects, also, the power of the empire was at this time much on the decline, particularly on account of the internal feuds of the nobles, who were not only hostile to the sovereign, but always at war with each other. Under the feudal system, as dominant in Germany, military service was obligatory on all ; but this only qualified the dukes and counts to aspire at independence, the freemen being held bound to follow the banners of their local chiefs, while the local chiefs, intent on mere selfish objects, did not consider themselves equally bound to follow the imperial standard, except for the defence of the country against foreign invaders. This, towards the close of the Franconian period, led to the raising of mercenary troops by the emperors, as they could no longer depend on a feudal army ; and, as both the mercenary troops and ducal forces shared in the predatory habits of the German nobles, the whole country was laid under contribution and plundered by them, which there was no power strong enough to prevent.

With the Suabian dynasty originated the terms Guelph and Ghibeline, which subsequently attained so much notoriety in the annals both of Italy and Germany. They were first used in the quarrel that broke out between Conrad III., the founder of the Suabian line, and Henry, duke of Bavaria, who opposed his election, the friends of Henry being called Guelphs after one of his ancestors, while those of Conrad were called Ghibelines, from Wibe-

lung, a town in which his family had originally resided. The greatest of the Suabian princes was Frederick Barbarossa; and yet he had, on the one hand, to fight on equal terms with one of his own vassals, Henry the Lion, duke of Saxony, whose defection compelled him to conclude a disastrous peace in Italy, by which he acknowledged the independence of the free cities of that country; and, on the other, was obliged so far to humiliate himself before the Pope as to hold his stirrup and kiss his feet. The personal vigour of the man, however, neutralised considerably the disadvantages of his position. He swayed the diets as he pleased, and secured great deference from his vassal princes generally, particularly after Henry the Lion was banished and deprived of his estates. This increased the power of his son, Henry the Severe, to such an extent that he was only prevented from making the empire hereditary in his family by the opposition of the Saxons. The last of the line was Frederick II., whose reign was particularly famous for the continuous struggle with the Holy See, known as the war of the Guelphs and Ghibelines—the latter name being adopted by the adherents of the emperor on account of his being a Suabian, while the former was taken up by the partisans of the Pope merely as a distinguishing and hostile designation. The war both in Italy and Germany assumed a ferocious character. At first the emperor was everywhere successful, till fortune veered towards the close of his career. His defeat at Parma was followed by his death; and the glory of the empire died with him, till it was resuscitated by the house of Austria.

The greatest obstacles to the well-being of Germany up to this period were created by her unfortunate connection with the spiritual Cæsar at Rome. The dual chiefs in

Italy and Germany could never agree; the quarrel between them was constant; and, as Germany was at the same time exposed to attacks from the Slavs and the Huns, and also suffered from internal disturbances caused by her dukes and counts, she had scarcely rest enough to form herself into such a compact empire as she might otherwise have become. The quarrel with the Vatican was a perpetual see-saw. In the reigns of Otho the Great and Henry III. the Pope got worsted, and the Romans were obliged to bind themselves never to choose a Pope without the emperor's consent. The tables were turned in the reign of Henry IV., who was summoned by Hildebrand to appear before him to give an account of his loose life, and actually presented himself at the gate of the Vatican barefooted, and stood there for three days, before Hildebrand would give him the absolution he begged for. So, also, had Frederick Barbarossa to hold the stirrup of Alexander III., and even gave offence to that haughty Pontiff from having got hold of the left stirrup instead of the right, for which mistake he was obliged to apologise. This pious insolence was maintained till the papal power began in the fourteenth century to decline; but even so late as Joseph I. (1705-11) we find the Pope able to rise up in arms against the imperial authority, although he was not able to sustain the opposition long, and was terrified into submission. What gave the popes the advantage was the power of excommunication exercised by them, which enabled them to raise even the subjects of the emperor—nay, even his own children—against him; and, in a country where the nobles were constantly looking out for excuses to embarrass their sovereign, the confusion thus produced was necessarily great.

The insecurity caused by these incessant troubles

throughout the empire led, in the thirteenth century, the chief cities of the north to form themselves into a confederation, called the Hanseatic League, for the protection and expansion of commerce. The history of this league is singular, and will bear to be repeated. Commerce had been advancing steadily from the eleventh century, but, for the reasons stated, not so satisfactorily as in other countries, the chief drawback felt by the cities of the north being the piracies in the Baltic, which the empire was not able to put down. The cities, therefore, took the matter into their own hands, and, joining together, soon rose to the dignity of a sovereign power. The chief emporiums of their commerce were London, Bergen in Norway, Novogorod in Russia, and Bruges in Flanders, each commanding the market of a wide extent of territory around it, throughout the whole of which the league enjoyed an uncontrolled monopoly with the assistance of the governments concerned, which were largely bribed. It augmented its usefulness by undertaking the opening of mines, encouraging domestic manufactures, and clearing and cultivating forests, which were soon covered with hemp, flax, and corn. It also raised towns in the place of hamlets, gave birth to a wish among the people for the comforts and conveniences of life, and furthered the cause of civilisation and refinement in divers ways, at the same time that it became strong enough to maintain an offensive war with Denmark, and was courted into alliance by the United Provinces, besides entering into treaties with other kings and States, and notably with the King of France. Eventually, it grew corrupt from its very success, and, being anxious to arrogate the whole trade of the north, began to exercise that force and rapine which it had originally arisen to sup-

press. This necessarily created many enemies, who rose up in defence of their respective rights, The increasing civilisation of Europe caused at the same time a diversion in the heart of the union itself. The cities of Holland and Friesland, though belonging to it, were the first to discover that independent action on their part would bring them greater advantages than the confederation was able to secure. They thereupon renounced the union; and the example was followed by other cities in time. In the seventeenth century only three cities kept up the union—namely, Lubeck, Hamburg, and Bremen—but without any particular advantage to themselves.

Another institution which came into prominence at about the same time with the league was the Teutonic order of Knighthood, called into existence by the king of Jerusalem, who, in consideration of the services rendered by the gentlemen-volunteers who had accompanied Frederick Barbarossa to the Holy Land, formed them into an order of knighthood on the plan of the Knights Templar and the Knights of St. John. This new institution was confirmed by the Pope, and Henry the Severe bestowed on it rights and lands. Returning from the Holy Land, the knights first took up arms against the Russians and other pagan races of the north, whom they kept at bay. In 1331, they conquered Prussia, or the land originally occupied by the Gothic tribe called Borussi, and at this time inhabited promiscuously by the Teutons, Wends, Letts, and Slavs; and they ruled over it as vassals of the king of Poland. They were, like the other knightly fraternities of the age, monks and crusaders, and bound by the vows of poverty and celibacy. In 1525, Albert, margrave of Brandenburg, grandmaster of the order, renouncing the priestly character, married and got chil-

dren, and his knights following the example established the secular kingdom of Prussia, the grandmaster becoming its first duke. The title of king was obtained later, by Frederick I., from the Emperor Leopold. These Teutonic knights were, like the knights of the other orders, very fond of tournaments and martial exercises. In Germany even ecclesiastics engaged in tourneys, which was rarely the case in any other country. But, unfortunately, predatory incursions were confounded by the knights of Germany with deeds of valour, and the noblest warriors were not ashamed to indulge in open robbery. The only object held in view by knighthood and chivalry in the country was to foster and preserve the military spirit of the nation, and that object was well attained. But the knight without reproach and shame was not a German specimen.

A third institution of the feudal times was the *Vehme Gerichte*, or secret tribunals of Germany, which bore for a long time a much-dreaded name. The feuds of the nobles and the lawlessness of the banditti maintained by them having filled the whole country with anarchy and violence, and there being no power in it able to check the reign of misrule and oppression, a little band of courageous and upright men took upon themselves the difficult task of finding an adequate remedy for the evils they laboured under, and with this view set up the secret tribunals, which are said to have existed before in the days of Charlemagne, but had long fallen into disuse since then. The courts were unconstitutional, but held their sittings in the open air, and not under ground as the romances describe. Their officers were all initiated, a necessary precaution for secrecy; but they numbered among them some of the greatest chiefs of the land,

and several of the emperors. Very great was the good achieved by them, particularly by the protection they afforded to the weak and the innocent. But they were continued too long, after the necessity for their existence had terminated; and, in their later stage, they not only ceased to be useful, but became absolutely injurious to the best interests of society, by contributing to prolong the reign of barbarism: though, taken altogether, it may still be conceded that they did greater good than harm to the poorer classes.

After the Suabian period Germany was for twenty years without a head, the crown not being a coveted prize. A fit successor was at last found in Rodolph of Hapsburg, a Swiss, who commenced his reign by renouncing the supremacy hitherto claimed by the empire over Italy, France, and Catalonia, as having belonged to it from the time of Charlemagne, and sat down to suppress internal disorders, and to establish peace and tranquillity. To this end he destroyed all the fortresses which the nobles had erected for purposes of plunder, and compelled them to submit their differences to arbitration. This revived Germany, which had become an extensive robbers' hold, from desolation; the peasant returned to his plough, and the merchant to occupations which had long ceased to be remunerative. Justly, therefore, was Rodolph held to be the second restorer of the empire—its greatest benefactor since the days of Charlemagne. For all that, he did not the less seek the aggrandisement of his own family; and, the rebellion of Ottocar, king of Bohemia, giving him the disposal of the duchies of Austria, Styria, and Carniola, he bestowed them, with the consent of the diet, on his son, whereby the house of Austria was founded. During the epoch that followed the hobby of conquering Italy was

revived, and the struggles with the Pope were renewed. In the reign of Ludovic IV. the diet took the bold step of publishing the Pragmatic Sanction, which expressly denied the right of the Pope to interfere in the election of the emperor; and in that of Charles IV. was promulgated the Golden Bull, so called from the golden seal attached to the document, which fixed the number and defined the prerogatives of the electors. Originally, the election was confided to the five principal nations of Germany—the Franks, Suabians, Bavarians, Saxons, and and Thuringians—each of whom constituted a duchy. To these the Lorrainers were afterwards added, but they never acquired equal influence with the rest, on account of their fluctuating relations between Germany and France. In later times the number of principalities and seigniories was greatly increased, till the election came to be made by all the princes of the empire assembled together, which necessarily gave rise to immense confusion, corruption, and extraneous interference. The electors were, therefore, now induced to transfer their powers to seven chiefs—a mystic number, selected for representing the seven candlesticks of the Apocalypse, and the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost. Three of these chiefs were ecclesiastics—namely, the bishops of Maintz, Treves, and Cologne; while the other four were secular princes—namely, the King of Bohemia, the Count Palatinate of the Rhine, the Duke of Saxony, and the Margrave of Brandenburg. The number was afterwards increased to eight, and eventually to nine. Besides this body, a wider council embraced all the chiefs entitled to sit on the diets or general assemblies with a deliberative and decisive voice, and included all the dukes, margraves, landgraves, burgraves, and counts, together with all the archbishops, bishops, and

abbots. To some imperial towns the same privilege was also conceded, with others, such as the regulation of the forms of government within their respective jurisdictions and the enactment of laws for their own control; but to the people of the country at large no similar concessions were ever made.

On the election of Rodolph the possessions of the house of Hapsburg in Switzerland were united to the empire, and became part and parcel of the dominion of Austria. The Swiss, as ever, were extremely jealous of their liberty, but remained perfectly submissive so long as no attempts were made to reduce them to servitude. Albert I., the son of Rodolph, irritated them by endeavouring to force on them all the claims of an absolute sovereign, which they would not allow; and, when the governors appointed by him attempted to domineer over them unduly, they rose up in arms against them, and expelled them. The story of Tell is apocryphal; he would not bow to Geisler's hat, and was compelled to shoot at an apple placed on his son's head. The mark was hit, and Tell liberated; but this act, it is said, aroused the indignation of the men of three cantons—Uri, Schwytz, and Unterwalden—who contemptuously renounced the authority of Austria. The battle of Morgarten, the Marathon of Switzerland, was fought in 1315, and secured the independence of that country. Subsequently, France and Burgundy attempted to coerce her, but without success. The house of Austria sold the greater part of its possessions in Switzerland to the cantons of Zurich and Berne.

In the Germanic Empire the house of Austria became dominant by the election of Albert II. to the throne, in 1437; and from that time to 1805, when the constitution of Germany was subverted by Napoleon I., the emperor

was always chosen from this line. This preference was secured by the great possessions and power already acquired by the house of Austria, which, by the marriage of Albert with the heiress of Sigismund, had united with itself the thrones of Hungary and Bohemia. Hungary was the country of the Huns, who had been constantly fighting with the Germans, even after they were fully defeated and confined for the time within their own territory by Otho the Great. They continued to be ruled by their own sovereigns till the union of their country with Austria subsequent to the death of Sigismund, though a permanent amalgamation was not effected till long after, in the reign of Ferdinand I. Bohemia, the country of the Boii, was also subdued by the Emperor Otho, but continued to be governed by its own dukes, who were, however, never wholly independent, being generally subject to Poland or Hungary, until the final annexation of the country with Austria, after the death of Sigismund. The possessions thus acquired by Austria were not very easy burthens, as they always gave her much trouble; but they also gave her a preponderance of power in the empire which was not possessed at this time by any other State. As was mentioned by the Bishop of Mainz at the election of Charles VI., the empire was a wife of high family without fortune, that had to be maintained at great expense, which the powerful house of Austria alone could afford. We read that at one time the empire was offered to an English sovereign, Edward III., by whom it was judiciously refused.

The reign of Maximilian I. commenced at about the time when the Middle Ages were terminated. Though France and Germany were hostile by their very position, no complications of any magnitude had arisen between

them up to this time. The marriage of Maximilian with the daughter of Charles of Burgundy first brought the two countries into direct collision. France seized all the provinces of Charles immediately after his death, excepting the Netherlands, which were acquired by Germany; but Maximilian regarded his son Philip as the rightful heir, not only of the Netherlands, but also of the States which France had annexed. The complication became greater from the subsequent marriage of Philip with the Infanta of Spain, as both France and Spain were contending for the throne of Naples; but Maximilian was not strong enough to oppose the French king effectually, and the fury of the contention was staved off to a later date. In the reign of Maximilian the diet established a perpetual peace in Germany by adopting vigorous measures for the suppression of private warfare, and by providing a paramount court of justice. The empire, hitherto divided into six circles, was now redistributed into ten, by the addition of new circles for Austria, the Netherlands, the Lower Rhine, and Upper Saxony; the public law was also better defined; the administration of justice reformed; and domestic wars between the cities and principalities were put a stop to by the imposition of the severest penalties. Maximilian was the first also to establish a standing army; and he so improved the artillery that he was called its founder.

The greatest sovereign of the house of Austria was Charles V., the son of Philip, who, besides his German possessions, including the Netherlands, was also king of Spain, Naples, Sicily, and the New World by right of his wife, which made him the most powerful monarch of his day in Europe. His election, as stated in the preceding chapter, was contested by Francis, king of France, whose

defeat made him an enemy, and led to unceasing contests, Charles being at the same time also much troubled on the confines of Hungary by the foe then most dreaded in Europe, the Turks. These difficulties were rendered interminable by the coalition of other States, and by the religious movement which was spreading steadily all over Europe. The age of Charles was the age of the Reformation. The clergy in Germany had long been disliked and hated. They had ample privileges and immunities which they had abused; and, since they were relieved from the depredations of the secular nobles, they had become more rapacious and tyrannical in the enforcement of their ecclesiastical demands. Their lives, moreover, were immoral, their imposture gross, and the sale of indulgences had made them thoroughly despised. The wish for a reformation had thus already arisen, and this not only in Germany, but also in Italy, where the schisms in the popedom had destroyed much of the reverence that had been paid to the Church. The subject had, moreover, been rendered illustrious by the poetry of Dante and Petrarch: the teachings of Luther were therefore warmly received, even from the outset. The same lessons were also taught by Zwingli in Switzerland, and were there equally well received; and they rapidly spread into France, the Low Countries, and England, where the ground had been prepared for their reception by the instructions of Wicliffe and his disciples. Charles detested the new doctrines. They were condemned by a diet assembled by him at Spires, against which decision the Elector of Saxony and other German princes, and the deputies of fourteen cities, protested, whence the name of "Protestants" was derived. A civil war followed. The emperor was obliged to temporise, for he needed the

assistance of all his subjects to get over his frontier difficulties. The liberty of conscience they contended for was therefore allowed; and this enabled him to tide over the imminent danger of the Turkish invasion, which was repelled. After that, diet after diet, and colloquy after colloquy, were held, in the vain hope of bringing back the dissidents to the bosom of the Church; and eventually, unable to suppress his real designs any further, Charles attempted to enforce them. In this he was unsuccessful. The Lutheran princes were equal to the occasion, and, with the aid of Francis, were able to maintain their convictions and secure the religious peace they sought for, Charles being compelled to permit the free exercise of the Protestant religion in the independent cities and principalities of the empire. This produced a revolution, which led to many changes, including a definition of the political constitution of the country. Intellect also was liberated, and religion and morals purified. But the spirit of Charles was embittered by the opposition he received; and, after a vain attempt to elevate his son to the throne, he abdicated it to his brother Ferdinand, who was elected to succeed him.

The Emperor Mathias, who succeeded in 1612, having undertaken to repress the Protestants, gave rise to the Thirty Years' War,—one of the most disastrous that ever afflicted any country, and which shook Europe to its very extremities. The Protestants were assisted by Gustavus Adolphus, king of Sweden, the greatest captain of the age, and the professed enemy of the house of Austria. They were also aided by the kings of Denmark and France. The death of Gustavus at the battle of Lützen cast a temporary gloom over their affairs; but the Swedish Generals who succeeded him ably sustained the

glory acquired by their king; and the French, under Turenne, were equally victorious. This led to the peace of Westphalia, by which the Protestants and Catholics were for the first time placed on an equal footing. The limits of the imperial, electoral, aristocratic, and municipal powers were also definitely prescribed, and a stable foundation laid for the international law of Europe. Germany was, by this agreement, dismembered of the Rhine Provinces, which France, in protection of the Protestant interests, had occupied and was permitted to retain, gaining thereby a facility of passage both into Germany and Italy; Sweden obtained a footing on German soil, which gave her the command of the Elbe and the Oder, and three votes at the diet; Switzerland was admitted to be free; while the different States composing the empire were gratified by a show of independence, which virtually made them weaker, by depriving them of the advantages of concord and union, and led to the smaller States being made dependent on the larger States, and to the subjugation of most of the imperial towns, once the chief seats of German wealth, prosperity, and commerce. From this time may be dated the rapid decline of the empire as a confederate body; which not only disabled Germany from withstanding any of the great powers without, but also made her subject to the domination of the great States within. The original phantom of a Holy Roman Empire, with its dual chiefs—spiritual and temporal—was now virtually dissolved; the empire was split up into parts, and those parts began very soon to quarrel among themselves for supremacy over each other; the right of the strongest was everywhere predominant: and everywhere the people were oppressed and ill-treated.

In the reign of Leopold I., Hungary was in rebellion, and the Turks, assisted by the insurgents and encouraged by France, laid siege to Vienna. They were defeated and driven away by Sobieski, king of Poland; after which Leopold was able to reduce Hungary, and then to join the confederacy formed for the purpose of restraining the encroachments of France. Like Francis I., Louis XIV. had also aspired to the imperial throne, which his ministers had claimed on his behalf during his minority, on the death of Ferdinand III. Not succeeding in obtaining it, Louis indulged, throughout the whole of his reign, in a series of the most unprovoked, wanton, and unprincipled aggressions on Germany, till a sense of common danger aroused other countries—Holland, Denmark, Sweden, and England—to combine against him, which led to his being eventually humbled by the successes of Marlborough. Germany was generally the scene of action, and suffered considerably on that account; but what it suffered more from was the constant endeavours which were now made by the emperors to extend the prerogatives of the Crown. Ever since the peace of Westphalia the house of Austria had always exhibited an eager desire to extinguish the liberties of the empire, and make the imperial crown hereditary in itself; and the disturbances created by Louis XIV. were so far beneficial to Germany that they prevented the emperors from completing the mischief they designed.

In 1741, Maria Theresa, the daughter of Charles VI., succeeded to the possessions of the house of Austria, under the terms of an edict previously passed by the diet at the instance of her father, which most of the powers of Europe had promised to defend. Many of those powers, however, when the occasion arose, thought it more favourable for

dismembering Austria of her vast possessions. The King of Prussia demanded Silesia; the King of Poland, Austria; the Elector of Bavaria, Bohemia; and the King of Sardinia, Milan. The crisis was hurried by the Elector of Bavaria, who, entering Upper Austria, took Lintz, and menaced Vienna. The terrified queen fled thereupon to Hungary, with her infant in her arms, and all Hungary rose up to a man to defend her cause. The grateful tears of Maria increased the enthusiasm of the Hungarians, and made them invincible; she received some assistance also from England: and the chivalrous bandits, who had expected to divide her dominions among themselves, were first astonished at the opposition improvised, and then content to draw back, after which the husband of Maria was elected emperor of Germany.

The great disturber of the peace of Europe at this period was Frederick II., king of Prussia, well-known as Frederick the Great. The secular kingdom of Prussia having been established by Albert of Brandenburg, the Prussians joined the Protestant cause, and began to develop themselves, intellectually and materially, as that cause was expanded. The temporal Cæsar opposed this more vigorously than the spiritual Cæsar; hard blows were exchanged; but the final result was the acquisition of more and more of German soil by the new State. In the reign of Leopold I. Prussia was raised to the dignity of a kingdom, the emperor having found a cordial supporter of his power in Frederick I. The second king, Frederick William I., amassed a considerable treasure, and formed an army of sixty thousand men; and these resources enabled his successor, Frederick II., considerably to enlarge his dominions. From the Queen of Hungary he obtained Silesia and Glatz; but what he gained most from was the

partition of Poland, of which he was the most active agent, and which was effected in concert with Russia and Austria, at a time when Poland was torn by intestine feuds and sunk in anarchy. Up to this time the Poles had done faithful service in Europe. As the French withstood the encroachments of Mahomedanism from the south, so did the Austrians and the Poles repel its encroachments from the east, after the reduction of the Eastern Empire by the Turks. But unfortunately, since 1542, the kingly office in Poland had been made elective, which gave rise to violent factions in the State, and compelled appeals to foreign powers that excited their cupidity. A disputed election at last became the pretext for the three great neighbouring sovereigns to interfere, and they decided in concert that the best remedy for the distemper which caused so much general uneasiness was to appropriate the kingdom to themselves, which Europe permitted without demur. The partition, designed in 1772, was not completed till 1795. Frederick II. died intermediately, in 1786, after having added a population of two millions to his paternal inheritance, doubled the revenue of his country, and formed an army of two hundred thousand men—the best-disciplined force in Europe. The power thus consolidated acted from this time as a counterpoise to the house of Austria in the affairs of Germany, which materially altered her position.

The wars of the French Revolution were commenced in 1792, as the inevitable sequel of the partition of Poland, which had compelled the Prussian and Austrian forces to remain inactive when their joint action in the Netherlands would have nipped the revolutionary movement in the bud. The Emperor of Germany had a personal interest in the commotion that followed, as being the brother of the

unfortunate Marie Antoinette who was guillotined, and the conflicts in Germany were necessarily numerous. These were ended for a time by the peace of Campo Formio, by which Austria was obliged to cede Italy and the Netherlands; but hostilities were soon after renewed under Napoleon I., and, Vienna being taken and occupied, the German constitution was, by the treaty of Presburg (1805), subverted, the emperor becoming Emperor of Austria only, and not of Germany, while the other German States were formed into a separate association called the Confederation of the Rhine, of which Bonaparte declared himself to be the Protector.

The triumphs of Bonaparte being abruptly terminated, the Confederation of the Rhine was, in 1815, replaced by an independent confederation, a permanent diet of plenipotentiaries from the States retaining sovereign power being established at Frankfort-on-the-Maine. The States represented were thirty-one in number; but, as some of the smaller ones voted jointly with others, the total number of representatives was seventeen—namely, from (1) Austria; (2) Prussia; (3) Bavaria; (4) Saxony; (5) Hanover; (6) Wurtemberg; (7) Baden; (8) the Electorate of Hesse; (9) Grand Ducal Hesse; (10) Denmark, for Holstein and Lauenburg; (11) the Netherlands, for Limburg and Luxemburg; (12) Saxe Meiningen, Saxe Coburg Gotha, and Saxe Altenburg; (13) Brunswick and Nassau; (14) the two Mecklenburgs; (15) the two Schwarzburgs; (16) Lichtenstein, Reuss, Schaumburg Lippe, Lippe Detwold, and Hesse Homburg; and (17) the free cities of Frankfort, Lubeck, Bremen, and Hamburg. In theory the votes were equal, and the jurisdiction of the diet extensive; but, as the greater powers jealously guarded their exclusive rights, the actual character of the

diet was rather that of a court of registration than of an independent body exercising sovereign powers. For the preservation of internal tranquillity the diet had extensive authority, but that authority was effectual only when enforced against the secondary States. As a league for enforcing respect from other nations, the confederation had a large army, but not the necessary unity for effective action; and generally, in all matters internal and external, its proceedings were marked by activity only when the great powers—Austria and Prussia—were agreed.

Unfortunately, that agreement was very rare. The precedency of Austria had been acquired with the assent of the confederated States, and under the sanction of all the great powers at the Congress of Vienna, by which the public law of Europe was re-established. But Prussia was not reconciled to it; her geographical position made her interests identical with those of the other German States; the interests of Austria were not the same with them to an equal extent. It was determined, therefore, by Prussia to throw Austria overboard, exclude her from taking part in German affairs, and remodel the confederation, so as to leave the control of the armed force of Germany entirely in Prussia's hands. Nothing short of this would have given Prussia the lead; and she was determined to be satisfied with nothing less. All the measures taken by Prussia for the attainment of this purpose were perhaps not justifiable; but the end held in view by her was accomplished. Ever since Jena and Wagram the necessity for a united Germany had been fully established. The arrangements subsequently made had also established that it was not possible for Prussia and Austria to pull together in one direction. The first position conceded to Austria she was unable to justify;

the Germanic leaven in her was too weak to enable her to accomplish the needful union; she had neither the military, nor the political, nor the moral strength required for it. Prussia felt that it was now her turn to try; and, as the thing had to be done, she cut off Austria summarily as an unnecessary excrescence, and became herself the nucleus of that united Germany which was wanted.

The federal execution in Holstein was undertaken in deference to the public opinion of Germany, to redress German wrongs, and only proposed to maintain the rights of Germany in the duchies. But the territorial acquisition secured on that plea was for Prussian aggrandisement alone, and Austria was made to aid in gaining it simply with a view to divide the odium of the robbery. That done, the pretext for quarrel between the two rival powers was not long to find, and Austria was defeated in war and victimised. By the treaty of Prague (1866) the dissolution of the Germanic confederation was completed and recognised, and Austria engaged to abstain from interference in the reconstruction of Germany, which was effected in the way Prussia wanted. The Elbe duchies were appropriated by Prussia, and a good many of the hitherto independent States were absorbed; while all the States left intact were made to acknowledge her supremacy. This freed Austria of all her German ties, and ought to enable her to consolidate her yet extensive dominions. We have not noticed the insurrections in Austria and Hungary in 1848 and 1849, which were only put down with the assistance of the Russians. The rule of Austria does not rest on a basis of common nationality, and political commotions of the sort were inevitable under the system of absolutism and centralisation which Austria had hitherto maintained.

Great efforts have since been made to re-erect the edifice, and considerable concessions have been granted to the Hungarians, Croatians, Böhemians, and Poles. But the only foundation on which a confederated constitution would stand perfectly safe—namely, the concession of equal rights and privileges to all parties—remains yet to be tried.

The war of Prussia with Austria settled the nucleus of the German nation ; a war with France was necessary to seal its federation. Prussia had armed herself for this ; but it would not be true to say that she forced the war on France, though there is no doubt that she tried very hard subsequently to get up a second war. The inconsiderate levity of France hurried on the first war, which she ought to have carefully guarded against ; and, after having defeated two Cæsars, Prussia took up the imperial crown and put it on. This crown is no longer dual : with Austria it has no further concern ; still less with the Vatican, though the Pope still affects to claim his original jurisdiction over the Western Empire. He continues to interfere with the administration of the country so far as Catholicism is concerned, for he does not know, he says, when his right to do so ceased. The answer is, that Germany, as now constituted, is not what Germany was in the past. It is a united Germany now in every sense of the word, recognising no ruler out of Germany, no alien jurisdiction, spiritual or temporal, over any spot of German land. Germany now is secular only, national, and independent.

But will this unity last ? It has existed since 1871, or more than twelve years now ; but the Emperor of Austria is hardly reconciled to it yet, and the French nation do not admit the contest with them to have finally

terminated. Prussia herself also seems to think that her only protection lies in the military system she has inaugurated—a system which holds out a dangerous precedent to Europe, but which has virtually existed in Prussia from the time of Frederick the Great. By it every man in the country has to educate himself as a soldier, and is bound to personal military service for a certain number of years. But can an army thus raised, which must be irresistible for purposes of national defence, be maintained at all times without telling injuriously on the people? The answer is not a difficult one to find; it has, in fact, been given, since no nation in Europe has yet ventured to adopt the system in its integrity. The cost of personal freedom and individual independence involved in it, would deteriorate the best and most flourishing nation in the world; it has deteriorated Prussia so far that she has not grown to the extent she might have done. Even France has colonies, but Prussia has none. It is certain that civilisation in Germany has been thrown back by it, and so hopelessly as to have no chance of reviving in a short time; and, if Germany has not yet very materially suffered therefrom, it is only because her population at this moment—of Prussia particularly—is more highly educated than that of any other country in Europe. But, even with this advantage, Germany will not, and cannot, long get on successfully with the clog she has placed upon herself. Providence did not mean men to be soldiers only; the human race has a higher destiny: and it requires no prophet to foretell that her military organisation will be Germany's ruin in the end.

Throughout Germany the belief is universal that there will be another war; and that before peace is assured France must be ground again—finer than before. This

Prussia may perhaps be able to achieve under the system she has adopted, since no country in the world can bring such a mass of soldiers on the field at once, in case of war, as she can. Her army will never fight at a distance; but with her next-door neighbour it must be absolutely irresistible. France, on her part, doubtless, nourishes a desire of vengeance; she did so against England after the battle of Waterloo. But, as then, she is not now, and for a long time to come will not be by herself, able to give effect to her wish. Besides, Germany has been wise in her generation. She has rectified her frontier by resuming territories—Alsace and Lorraine—which belonged to her of old and were forcibly taken away from her by Louis XIV., and these, properly guarded, do not leave the egress from France as easy as it was in the past. All the hopes of France of vengeance must depend, therefore, on a coalition with other powers—with Austria, England, and Russia. England is too wise to intermeddle in matters that do not concern her personally, and is not likely besides to do so against Germany, since in the whole history of Europe they have never been at war with each other. Russia, also, will not interfere, because her hands are full with her own affairs. Austria, without the conjunction of England or Russia, will never commit herself to espousing one side or the other. It will be a long time, therefore, before France is able to secure that co-operation without which she can have no chance of success. Why, then, should Germany continue to be so strongly armed, and by her attitude force her neighbours to maintain ruinous forces? The game is a dangerous one even for her to play at, and is pressing very hard on the Prussian people. Empires based on military glory are always subject to suicidal tendencies,

and destroy themselves; and Socialism has developed itself in Germany very unduly already.

The early history of Germany is simply the history of a few great figures—known as emperors and popes, dukes, margraves, and counts; very little being known of the people beyond this, that they ate, drank, married, settled, fought, and died, as large masses of human beings are doing at this moment of whom history will say nothing in the future. At the outset the freemen would not even acknowledge kings; but, under the names of counts and dukes, the right of governing them was soon acquired, and very soon abused: At no period and under no dynasty were they admitted to a share in the administration, except in the case of the independent cities, which, banding together, were confederated into a power that forced respect. The general feature of the administration all over the country was an aristocratic rule—a rule of robbers who partitioned the empire among themselves, exercising their sway under the nominal supremacy of a chief whom they set up, but who in rare instances was able to control their behaviour fully. Constant wars kept these unruly spirits perpetually engaged. The Hungarians, Bohemians, Poles, and Turks gave them ample work without; and, when not so engaged, they were ever fighting with each other within. The character of a fighting race was thus always maintained.

The temporal Cæsar, as emperor of the West, had an indirect jurisdiction over all the outside kingdoms of the Christian commonwealth; but this, of course, was an authority that could not, and was not attempted to be exercised. He reigned with vigour who was able to govern his own diet and check the perpetual disorders created by his own nobles. As in France at the outset,

so in Germany almost at all times, the kingdom was only an aggregation of petty sovereignties—not a homogeneous whole—of which the real rulers were the dukes and counts, while every gentleman who held a fief or knightly tenure under them arrogated a legal right to pillage, which neither serf nor sovereign was able to resist. The aristocracy of the country was of two kinds—one directly subject to the jurisdiction of the empire, the other subject also to the jurisdiction of the immediate ruler of the principality, or dukedom, to which the noblemen belonged. A united aristocracy was never known; the subordinate chiefs of distinct States, when in an unreasonable temper, scarcely submitted to imperial control; and many were the emperors who were obliged to rule even over their vassals and sub-vassals by conciliation, wholly unaccompanied by force.

Another great power in the State was the clergy, ostensibly representing the spiritual Cæsar, but oftener arrayed against him than on his side. Barring the opposition they received from the secular nobles, the clerical nobles also had their own way in everything. They were represented in the diet, and that gave them a consequence which was abused. The spiritual labour devolving on them was perfunctorily performed, though no country was plunged in greater darkness than Germany, or stood in greater need of the self-denying and magnanimous virtues to civilise her. They liked the good things of the earth better than the saving of souls, and their demands on the people were not less rapacious than those of the lay lords, whereby the reign of anarchy, confusion, and ignorance was prolonged. The disputes between them and the people were constant and interminable; and their profligacy of life led to that early call for a reformation which, in the case of the Hussites,

united the two questions of religious abuses and serfdom, and had to be put down by a combination of spiritual and secular arms.

All the progress that Germany has since made has been effected after the days of the Reformation, and mainly under the direction of Prussia. The foundations of a liberal education were, it is true, laid in the schools attached to the cathedrals and monasteries established by the Anglo-Saxon missionaries at the outset; but the studies there prosecuted rarely included anything beyond the elements of theology, history, and the canon law, with a moderate share of arithmetic, geometry, and natural philosophy, even these being confined within the limits of the cloisters. Greater proficiency was attained by the clergy in the art of magic—especially in the thirteenth century, when the rage for magic was at its height. It was reserved for Prussia, after she became a great State, to free letters and the sciences from spiritual censorship, and incite them to exert their own strength, which soon led to the cultivation of those studies for which the German mind has been found to be so peculiarly well-fitted. The progress since made in the sciences and arts has been, accordingly, very great: in philosophy the reputation gained by the German is second to none; he has also made many ingenious improvements in mechanics. The country that has produced Klopstock, Kant, Herder, Humboldt, Lessing, Hegel, Goethe, and Schiller, has, indeed, well vindicated her position in the foremost rank of education and intelligence. But her advance in manufactures and commerce has not been equally great; nor will it be so till her political system is amended. In manufactures especially, Germany stood foremost before the Thirty Years' War, which dispersed

her citizens all over Europe. The restoration to that pre-eminence ought to be a higher object to her than the armed superiority now so ardently wished for. Referring to her own history, we find that in the wars with Napoleon I. the Germans suffered so long only as the people would not fight with a heart for a mere choice of despots, but that the tables were turned in 1813, when the youth of Germany burned with patriotic ardour to earn liberal institutions for their country by the expulsion of the French. The same aspiration for liberal institutions is exhibiting itself again, and no attitude which is not favourable to it will endure. At present the government is very strong—stronger than the people. This feature must be altered, or very much modified. As the people get stronger—stronger than the government set over them—will the commercial and industrial spirit of the nation be developed. The constitution of the country must also be reorganised. The farce of popular representation and self-government exists ; but the Reichstag, as now constituted, will never meet the requirements of the age, and the requirements of Germany will soon make themselves to be understood.

CHAPTER VII.

RUSSIA.

RUSSIA has been correctly designated an anomalous member of the European confederacy, being quite as irregular in her constituency, in comparison with other States, as Turkey herself. The fact is, she is an Asiatic power, recently, and almost forcibly, Europeanised, and has not yet fully benefited by the metamorphosis. With one foot in Europe and the other in Asia, she partakes of the character of both continents, and the incongruities arising therefrom have not yet been sufficiently harmonised to be imperceptible. The barbarism of her people is as remarkable as the immensity of her dominion, and these two traits together impart to her features a savage majesty special to herself. At first sight she appears to be richer and more powerful than all the sister-states whose acquaintance she has forcibly cultivated. But on more intimate acquaintance with her she betrays greater deficiencies than any of them, and the marks of her fragility become palpable in the very vastness of her territory. No empire can be more subject to the caprices of fortune than hers is. To-day it extends from the Baltic to the Pacific, from the Frozen Ocean to Tartary and the Crimea : but there is nothing to prevent its splitting up to-morrow into as many subdivisions as there are nations in it differing from each other in habits,

manners, and language; and this will inevitably happen when those nations get sufficiently educated to be able to understand their rights. The past history of this vast empire is very sad and gloomy; its present history is scarcely much brighter; and it seems that to retain its integrity it is essential that it should also retain its sadness, gloom, and barbarism. No page in the annals of Russia exhibits anything that is bright, heroic, or ennobling, except that which records the recent liberation of the serfs; and to what that may eventually lead is yet very uncertain.

The most anciently known inhabitants of Russia were the Scythians in the south, the Slavs in the centre, and the Finns in the north. Of their earliest source no traditions exist. It is believed that the inundations from Central Asia were constant; but they do not appear to have ever penetrated in a northern direction beyond Kief, which was built by the Slavs of the Danube on their being beaten back by the Bulgars. A Slav colony also founded the city of Novogorod further to the north. But, beyond that, the attacks and alliances were always from and with the nations of the West—namely, the Varangians, Northmen, or Scandinavians, those hardy pirates who by their persistence and valour overturned such a large portion of Europe. The government of Russia was at this time a republic, which was not wanting in strength; its headquarters being at Novogorod, which was so formidable to its neighbours that it was a common saying among them—"Who can dare to attack God, or Novogorod the Great!" This power implies conquest; and it is known that all the nations from Lithuania to the Oural Mountains, and from the Rostaf to the White Sea, were governed by the Novogorodians

as tributaries. Their commerce, also, was large, extending to Constantinople in one direction, and Persia and India in another.

The trade through the Baltic having been molested by the Varangians, hostilities broke out between them and the Novogorodians, in which the latter were worsted. The enfeeblement of the State followed; and, becoming unable to retain their independence, the Novogorodians invited the Varangians to come and fight their battles for them. It was the old story of Hengist and Horsa again. The invitation was accepted by three brothers, of whom Rurik was the eldest. Having established themselves in Novogorod as auxiliaries, they were not slow in making themselves masters of it. The republic was overturned in 862, and a grand-principality established, of which Rurik was the chief. Shortly afterwards, Oskold and Dir, two other Varangian chiefs, founded a separate principality in Kief; and, in the tenth century, one Regnvold held distinct sway at Polotsk. The original republic was thus in all directions completely overturned.

The dominion founded by Rurik was rapidly and prodigiously enlarged by his successor Oleg, who acted as regent during the minority of Rurik's son, Igor, and who by craft and perfidy acquired the possession of Kief, to which the seat of the grand-principality was removed. Acting from this base, Oleg was able to secure a large part of the territory now known as European Russia; and, not content therewith, he descended the Dnieper, at the head of eighty thousand men, devastating the Greek Empire even to the walls of Constantinople, to which he was as formidable in his day as any of his successors has ever been. His warriors returned to their country laden with gold, rich stuffs, and wines; and, buying

peace on such terms, the Greeks held out a tempting bait to the barbarians, which induced them to repeat their attacks on the empire frequently. The tact of Oleg was displayed in securing the good-will of the tribes and races he vanquished; and this enabled him to collect under his banners vast hordes of different races, which made his arms irresistible.

The death of Oleg restored Igor to the principality founded by his father; but he had to encounter on his accession an insurrection of the peoples recently conquered by Oleg, of whom one, the Petchenegs, gave him much trouble. The revolt was eventually put down, after which Igor devastated Paphlagonia, Pontus, and Bithynia, and then turned his arms against the Drevalians, by whom he and his companions were massacred. This reverse was fully avenged by his wife Olga, who acted as regent during the minority of her son Sviatoslaf, and who laid the country of the Drevalians waste with an atrocity instances similar to which are only to be found in Russian history. She then went to Constantinople to be baptised! being the first Christian in Russia who exercised sovereign power. Her government is well spoken of; she divided Russia into administrative districts; and the kindness of her rule filled the hearts of her people with affection and respect, by which means she obtained the name of St. Olga after death. It is said that her conversion and visit to the capital of the Greek Empire were prompted by a desire to consolidate commercial relations with the countries of the south; so that, male or female, the sovereigns of Russia have always had an eye on the tempting wealth of Turkey, and the commercial and political ascendancy to be gained by dealing with her.

Sviatoslaf, the son of Igor, was regarded as the Achilles of his age; a rough and impetuous soldier, who rejected the pious exhortations of his mother that he should become a Christian, by the characteristic question—Whether she wished him to be a laughing-stock to his friends? His life was simple as that of a Tartar. He had no other habitation than the camp, lay on the bare ground or on a piece of coarse felt—the saddle of his horse serving for a pillow, and fed on the flesh of horses. His troops, devoted to him, were similarly inured, and he was thereby enabled to carry war to great distances without embarrassment. He conquered all the country between the Tanais and the Borysthenes, the Chersonesus Taurica and Hungary. As distinguished from the treachery of the times and the people he reigned over, he never attacked his enemies without a previous declaration of war. The greatest defeat he sustained was from the Greeks, by whom he was expelled from Bulgaria; and, the Petcheneguans falling on him in his retreat, he and his small band were killed, his skull, surmounted by a golden circlet, being used as a drinking-cup by the chief by whom he was slain. It was in the reign of Sviatoslaf that territories began to be given away in Russia as private appanages to princes of the blood—a pernicious custom, which in a short time broke up the principality into a lot of little States, and weakened the unity of the Russian power.

The first sovereign of the empire who adopted and solidly established Christianity in Russia was Vladimir the Great, who also became a saint. He had six wives and eight hundred concubines, and his character was so infamous that no maid or matron of any attraction who came to his notice was safe from his lust. The prowess

of his arm was also great, and he forced back to obedience all the tributary nations that had revolted after the death of Sviatoslaf, at the same time that he brought other nations under his yoke. The power and fame of the man induced four religions to contend for his conversion—namely, Mahomedanism, Judaism, Catholicism, and the Greek Church. The example of his ancestress, Olga, led him to prefer the last; but before receiving the rite of baptism he made a preparatory raid on Greece, the rite being concluded by a new marriage, with Anna, the sister of the Greek sovereign, on which the conquests made by Vladimir were restored. After this, all the idols of Russia were thrown into the Dnieper; but beyond that there was no religious persecution, and the wish for conversion among the Russians was spontaneous. The people were in too low a state of civilisation to care for any religion much; they had no objection to any form of worship that pleased their sovereign; and, when a proclamation was issued asking the inhabitants of Kief to repair to the banks of the river to be baptised, the order was promptly and joyfully obeyed.

The first legislator of Russia was Yaroslaf, a son of Vladimir, who commenced by revolting against his father, and finished by conquering his brothers, after which he became a zealous promoter of Christianity. He was the first to disseminate instruction and civilisation broadcast throughout his dominions, to establish schools, and to wage a continuous war against sorcery and superstition. He also had the Bible translated into Slavonian—a vast undertaking for the age; and he gave Russia a code of laws for which he was principally famous, though all he did was confined to the collection, collation, and registration of the laws and customs which already existed

and were sanctioned by time, removing or disentangling therefrom the complications that had crept in. Unfortunately, he continued the practice of dismembering the empire by parcelling it out among the princes of the blood. The defect in the primitive constitution was thus in a manner legally perpetuated, which at a later date so weakened Russia as to make her an easy prey to the Tártárs. Yaroslaf was nevertheless one of the greatest princes of his dynasty; and to him and Vladimir belongs the credit of having made Russia European, as well by their conquests towards the West, the religion they introduced in it, the efforts they made to civilise the people, and their alliances. The daughters-in-law of Yaroslaf were Greek, German, and English princesses; his sister was queen of Poland; his daughters were queens of Norway, Hungary, and France.

The whole authentic history of Russia embraces a period of only a little above one thousand years, which is divided into five great epochs, the first extending from 862 to 1054, which was the period of establishment and consolidation; the second extending from 1055 to 1237, which comprised the period of dissensions and anarchy; the third, from 1238 to 1461, which is known as the period of complete slavery; the fourth, extending from 1462 to 1612, generally recognised as the period of deliverance and despotism; and the last, from 1613 to the present time, which may be called the period of European civilisation. A minute examination of all these epochs is not necessary. The first period was one of progress. The soldier-kings who commenced it exhibited, in spite of their ferocity and barbarism, traits of greatness deserving attention. A paramount throne, a religion, a code of laws, were all established by them. But the second period was one of relapse, character-

ised mainly by an unparalleled amount of feebleness and incapacity, diversified at times by bloody struggles and horrible catastrophes, a very general allusion to which will be sufficient. The civilisation that Russia had attained was surrounded on all sides by the densest barbarism. The civil commotions that followed the absence of the genius and spirit of the first rulers weakened the garrison within, at the same time that it strengthened the enemy without. The outer barbarism, therefore, was shortly triumphant. Kief, softened by the manners of Byzantium, ceased to instruct; the influence and energy of Central Russia, still pagan and barbarous, was renewed. The civil wars were accompanied by innumerable assassinations; and the confusion was augmented by the attacks of the Poles, Hungarians, and Tártárs.

The only princes of note during the second period were Vladimir Monomachus and Andrew. The first distinguished himself in distant campaigns, mainly undertaken for the redress of injuries; and yet more by his endeavours to secure the peace of the country, and by the succour he gave to the weak against the oppression of the strong. The second, Andrew, was artful and politic, and is best known for having removed his seat of government to Vladimir, to withdraw it from the attacks of the Poles and the nomad tribes bordering on Kief. He also aggrandised Moscow, and drew into Central Russia, by the attractions of peace, all the population of the south, who were worried by the disturbances that raged around them. The other princes of the period were only unfortunate burdens on the country, which they did their best to distract with all the horrors of rivalry and war, till, towards the middle of the twelfth century, the grand-principality was reduced to little more than the capital and its immediate surroundings,

and the paramount sovereignty to a vain title which was neither respected nor feared.

These intestine divisions led to the subjugation of Russia in the third period, which was the era of Chingez Khán, who united the Moguls and the Tártárs under him, and extended his barbaric dominion in every direction. After having conquered all Asia, he turned his eyes towards Europe; and, the plan sketched out by him being adhered to by his successors, they penetrated westward as far as Hungary and Poland, whence, being disgusted by the poverty of the inhabitants, they turned back upon Russia, where they destroyed everything before them, ravaging what they did not conquer, and collecting tribute and slaves. The southern part of Russia was conquered in 1224, but the subjection of the whole country was not completed till 1237-40, by Bátou Khán, a grandson of Chingez. The Tártárs did not settle in Russia; the Khán of the Golden Horde had only his headquarters in it, but his people wandered about as nomads, and the princes of Russia were not unthroned. They were allowed to reign, paying tribute; and no prince, from the time of Yaroslaf II. to that of Ivan III., dared to arrogate regal powers without having first paid homage to the Khán as his suzerain. It is said that they took the oath of fidelity on their knees, and in terms of abject servility; and this degradation was continued for more than two centuries—namely, from the commencement of the thirteenth to the middle of the fifteenth century. Occasionally, when the Tártárs were caught nodding, revolts against them were attempted: but the Golden Horde was always strong enough to suppress these; and on one occasion Russia was saved from absolute destruction only by the intercession of Alexander, prince of Novogorod, whom the Tártárs regarded with affection

and respect. This prince also did service to his country by defeating the Teutonic knights of Prussia on their endeavouring to strip Russia even of what the Tártárs had spared ; and, the battle having been gained on the banks of the Neva, he obtained the name of Nevski from the success of his arms. Another grand-prince whom the Tártárs esteemed was Iván I., surnamed Kalita, who was able with their assistance to reunite the appanages of the grand-principality, after which he removed the seat of government to Moscow, the position of which, being central, was considered to be best suited for reuniting the whole empire ; and this enabled the grand-prince to re-establish order and justice, encourage commerce, open out marts and fairs, and concentrate the sovereign power, which necessarily undermined the supremacy of his suzerain.

The first to refuse tribute to the Golden Horde was Dimitri, whose contumacy gave rise to reciprocal incursions into the territories of each other by the Russians and the Tártárs. Finally, the latter, advancing against the grand-prince in large numbers, were met by him and defeated on the banks of the Don, for which victory he received the surname of Donski. But new Tártár hordes were not slow in coming forward ; and Dimitri, abandoned by his brother-princes, being unable to withstand these, the consequence was, that Moscow was devastated, the country around it ravaged, and the inhabitants massacred. In the reign of Vassili II., a fresh descent on Moscow was threatened by a different devastator, Timour, who had intermediately destroyed the empire of the descendants of Chingez. But his thoughts took soon after a different direction, though not till the Golden Horde, which had hitherto exacted tribute from the Russians, had received

from him a severe blow from which it never rallied. The struggles between the grand-princes and the Tártárs henceforth became more frequent, and the tributes imposed by the latter were paid or refused as the Kháns happened to be strong or imbecile. The amounts of the tributes paid were also regulated by the same test; and if Vassili III., driven from his throne by a more fortunate competitor, went to implore the protection of the Tártár chief, it was only because he did not know where else to seek for aid.

Of the fourth epoch the greatest sovereign was Ivan III., called Ivan the Great, who had both intelligence and vigour to profit by the movement which had set in for reuniting the dismembered principality, with a view to re-establish one single and despotic throne. To this end he devoted his entire energies; and, the Tártárs having already become enfeebled by intestine divisions, he commenced by operating against them, which he knew would help him best in carrying out internal reforms. He accordingly undertook an exterminating war against them, refused to pay tribute to the Golden Horde, and eventually succeeded in destroying it with atrocities peculiar to the age. The Nagais, another branch of the race, but enemies of the Golden Horde, completed the extermination of those whom the Russians had spared; and thus was Russia liberated. After this, Ivan found it comparatively easy to reduce the independent princes who shared amongst them the heritage of Rurik; defeated the Poles in one direction and the Teutonic knights in another; and became sole and absolute master of all Russia, into which he imported the civilisation of the south. He brought over arts and artists from Italy, and all the knowledge of the Greeks; raised the Kremlin with the aid of engineers fetched from Ger-

many; had cannons cast and placed over it; and procured the services of foreign miners to work the mines of Petchora, which were discovered during his reign, which enabled him to coin money both in silver and copper. The weight of Russia was by these means brought to bear on the balance of Europe, and the administration of the country was at the same time improved by a reorganisation of the clerical order, whose manners were reformed, and by the enactment of a new code of laws which kept pace with the general improvement of the country.

The complete restoration of the principality was achieved by Ivan IV., the Terrible, known in history as the first Czar, though that title had been conferred previously by the Greek emperor on the son of Yaroslaf I., and again on Ivan III. on his marriage with the Greek princess Sophia. The word has been supposed by many to be a corruption of the title Cæsar, but this is erroneous. It is an old oriental expression signifying supreme authority; and, as the authority of the grand-duke—a title which Ivan III. had assumed in preference to that of grand-prince—had become supreme from the time of Ivan IV., he was justly entitled to the name he adopted. He concentrated his power more fully even than his immediate predecessors had done; established a standing army, which went by the name of the *Strelitz*, or imperial guards; compelled the nobles to accept service, the richest at their own cost, and the rest on small pay, these constituting the best strength of his empire; but left the cultivators, inhabitants of towns, and especially traders, free to follow their own occupations, except in times of imminent danger, when they too had to bear arms. He, at the same time, improved the civil organisation of the

empire, encouraged, like Ivan III., the importation of foreign industry, opened the first printing-office in Moscow, rearranged the laws, negotiated treaties of commerce with the nations of the West, and established a market at Narva, to which the English, French, Dutch, and Lubeckers resorted. He also subdued the Tártárs of Kasan and Astrakhán ; but was, on the other hand, obliged to abandon Esthonia and Revel to the Swedes, and Livonia to the Poles. What Ivan's reign was, however, best known for, were his cruelties, which were frightful. The number of men and women destroyed by him cannot be counted. The people of Novogorod having ventured to revolt, were mercilessly killed, the massacre being continued for five weeks ; the inhabitants of Pleskop and Twér, who were accused of secret intelligence with Poland, were first tortured and then decapitated, while eight hundred of their women were drowned. Every day the Czar invented new modes of punishment : he let loose bears from his menageries wherever he saw crowds, and amused himself by listening to the cries of those who were attacked and torn to pieces ; stripped women naked and had them dishonoured before he allowed their sufferings to terminate ; compelled people to become parricides and fratricides, and then punished them for the crimes they were forced to perpetrate ; and yet, in the midst of so many murders and so many victims, there was not one hand raised to oppose his power. In his reign Siberia was conquered by Jermak Timofief, a hetman, or chief, of the Cossacks of the Don, who was loaded with honours and favour, not so much for his conquest as for the carnage and ferocity by which it was characterised.

At the end of the fourth epoch Boris Godunof, the descendant of a Tártár, and the brother of the wife of

Ivan IV., became king, by the murder of an infant prince named Dimitri, with whom the race of Rurik was terminated. Having cleared the way for himself, Godunof pretended that he had no desire to ascend the throne. He even affected to fly from it, and sought refuge in a monastery, where the grandees and the people besieged him with supplications which he continued to resist. The sceptre was at last forced on him; two public elections mastered his aversion for grandeur: and the imperial power was assumed under the guise of the purest virtue and the noblest disinterestedness. He then completed the scheme which Ivan III. and Ivan IV. had chalked out, stifled the power of the nobles, and reduced the whole nation to an order of slaves. No free intercourse, no public meeting, no travelling through the country, no public minstrelsy even, was permitted during his reign without imperial licence; serfdom of the soil was firmly established; and, if the peasants fled in large numbers to seek freedom among the Cossacks, in still larger numbers they submitted to the life that was marked out for them. Godunof was not prodigal in crime, though he did not spare it. What he did, however, was done privately; and his reign would have passed off quietly but for the appearance of two impostors, one after another, who personated the prince Dimitri who had been murdered, and who, with the assistance of the Poles, gave rise to a revolt. At this crisis Godunof died, while some assert that he poisoned himself. The disturbances continued for some time after his death; Russia was distracted, and fell into such a state of weakness that her neighbours vied with each other in encroaching on her territory: till at last arose the unanimous cry of—"Death to the Impostor!" which, after some further commotions, was succeeded by the election

of Michael Romanoff, a young man of sixteen years, to the throne. This choice was directed by the clergy, Michael being the son of Philaretos, the Patriarch of all the Russias ; and it received the cordial support of the people owing to some ill-defined relationship that the Romanoffs bore, or pretended to bear, to the house of Rurik.

Michael ascended the throne in 1613, which commenced the fifth period of Russian history. Of the first period, the great sovereigns, we have seen, were Rurik, the founder ; Oleg, the conqueror ; Olga, the regent ; Vladimir, the Christian ; and Yaroslaf, the legislator. The second and third periods were less productive of great rulers, Vladimir Monomachus and Andrew having belonged to one, and Alexander Nevski, Ivan Kalita, and Dimitri Donski to the other ; and throughout both of them the condition of Russia was one of much depression and despondency. The fourth period was that of deliverance, but unfortunately also of despotism ; and the only great kings it produced—namely, Ivan the Autocrat, Ivan the Terrible, and Boris Godunof—were also those who riveted the chains most firmly on the people. In the first period the descendants of Rurik were all in all, and divided and subdivided the country among themselves, and were absolute masters, who did not permit the intervention of other classes. “I am a prince,” was the boast of the age, “and am not made to take advice from monks or the mob.” The subsequent weakness of the rulers brought the nobility to the foreground. The subjection of the people dates from the Tártár conquest, when slaves were asked for and given, and previous to which the infliction of corporal punishment was not known. In the reign of Ivan III. slavery was systematically established, the penalties enforced by his code being the knout, bondage, and death. It was

he who first enforced blind servility, to which the people, already cowed down by the fear of the Tártárs, submitted with willingness. Up to the time of Ivan IV. the ignorance of the Russians was so great that reading and writing were generally unknown. A people originally free were by these means thoroughly enslaved.

The reign of Alexis was chiefly famous for his war with the Poles, which resulted in the relinquishment by the king of Poland, in favour of the Czar, of the supremacy he had exercised till then over the Cossacks of the Ukraine. It was also distinguished by the re-establishment of communications with China, which had been interrupted, and by communication and trade with Persia being resumed. Internally, it was marked by a revolt, not against the authority of the Czar, but against that of his prime-minister, Morozoff, who exercised the sovereign power in a manner that exhausted the patience of the people. Rising *en masse* they captured and killed the relatives of the minister, after which they laid siege to the palace. The Czar implored them to spare Morozoff; and this was agreed to on two or three other noblemen, his principal agents, being surrendered, whom they tore to pieces in their fury. This was quite a new thing in Russia. It was opposed to the creed of profound servility to which the people were habituated. A taste for sedition and blood being thus acquired, new troubles arose in other parts of the empire, which had to be put down. In the east a brigand, a Cossack of the Don, emulating the audacity of Chingez and Timour, threatened to lay siege to Moscow and make it the tomb of the nobles, priests, and soldiers; but his luck and prudence were not equal to his boast, and on his being captured and quartered, the rest of Alexis's reign was undisturbed.

The greatest prince of the house of Romanoff was Peter the Great, of whom it is not necessary to say much, though very little cannot well be said of him. He was proclaimed sovereign jointly with Ivan V., his half-brother; and, both being minors at the time, his half-sister Sophia was appointed regent. Many attempts were made by Sophia to exclude Peter from the throne, and prolong her authority during the perpetual infancy of the weak-minded Ivan; but, at the age of seventeen, Peter was able to subvert her intrigues and defeat an attempt made to assassinate him, after which the tables were turned upon her, and she was shut up in a convent. Ivan dying a few years after, Peter became sole autocrat, and commenced a reign which is particularly instructive, as showing what an original mind, however barbarous, may achieve when left untrammelled to itself. The cruelties of the man were revolting; but his regal acts were stupendously great—greater than the labours of any Hercules who had preceded him. The views of the king were singularly liberal for a mind so utterly unenlightened. His first act, we have said, was to defeat the plan laid against his life. A nocturnal conflagration had been designed by the Strelitz, at the instance of Sophia, in which he was to have been murdered. The plot was discovered, and the conspirators captured and punished—brutally, with all the fierceness of an exasperated barbarian. They were first put to the rack, then mutilated and killed; after which their heads and limbs were prominently exposed. This was to have been expected from the ferocity of the man and of the times. The enmity of the Strelitz impressed on Peter the necessity of raising a body of land forces on whom he could depend, sufficiently strong to overpower opposition of any magnitude; and

the idea was carried out as soon as it arose. The first nucleus of this army were fifty of the king's own companions in debauchery, whom he trained up personally for the service. This force was gradually augmented till it reached the modest strength of two hundred thousand men; and, to render it fully efficient, he got engineers and gunners from Germany, Holland, and Prussia, to instruct his soldiers. The idea of a fleet was similarly acquired by the sight of the remains of a sailing-boat, which was repaired for the Czar, and carried him afloat. Fifty young men were thereupon sent to Italy to learn the art of navigation, as forty young men had previously been sent to Germany to acquire military discipline. Not content with this, the Czar proceeded personally to foreign parts, and especially to Holland and England, to learn ship-building and other useful acquirements; and, on his return from those countries, he brought back with him not only artificers, but also geometers and mathematicians to educate his people. A strong navy was now constructed, consisting of forty ships of the line, and two hundred galleys with sails and oars; and a multitude of experienced mariners was secured to man it.

His first tour carried Peter to Brandenburg, Denmark, Holland, England, and Vienna, from the last of which places he intended to proceed to Venice and Rome, when he was recalled by the news of a general insurrection of the Strelitz at home. In a second tour he visited Holland again, and France. When he came back from his first tour, his army had already defeated and crushed out the rebellion; but that was not enough for the offended Czar. Seven thousand prisoners were hanged or beheaded, with every refinement of diabolical cruelty, Peter assisting in

the execution with his own hands. Even the widows and children of the culprits were not left free, but deported to distant and desert places for crimes not their own; and all subsequent insurrections were similarly dealt with. His cruelties to his own family were equally fiendish. His first wife, Eudoxia Lapukin, was divorced for adultery, imprisoned, and scourged, while her lover was impaled alive. His son by the divorced Czarina, having been tried for rebellion, was condemned and poisoned, the poison being administered by the infatuated father himself. The second wife was the widow of a Swedish soldier, captured amid the ruins of a pillaged town. She had two lovers before her marriage with the Czar, and one after that period, which was discovered only towards the termination of Peter's life, and was punished by the decapitation of the lover, though Catherine, for the many services she had rendered her husband, was spared.

The great object of Peter's life was to civilise his people. He became a soldier and a sailor to teach them the art of war by sea and land; after that he became a merchant and a manufacturer, to teach them the arts of peace. In all his undertakings, perseverance was the prime agent; and he succeeded in teaching his people every branch of useful industry. He also introduced a multitude of reforms in civil and ecclesiastical affairs, and in the usages of society. For some of these reforms he was named "Antichrist" by the priests: but he gave more to the Church than he took away from her; and, while he made the clergy more regular and learned, he gave them no real cause to be dissatisfied with him, except that he abolished the Patriarchate, the honours of which were assumed by himself. His other achieve-

ments included the formation of a regular police, the establishment of a multitude of elementary schools and colleges for science, belles-lettres, and the arts, the establishment of a library, the formation of a botanical garden, etc. Beside all this, he founded St. Petersburg—a city larger than London itself, though of course neither so rich nor so well-peopled,—and Cronstadt, which was completed by Nicholas, and which an English admiral, at the head of an English fleet of uncommon strength, was unable to bombard. What was better understood still was that he gave Russia six provinces, two seas, an extended commerce, fortresses and ports, and the army and navy to which we have referred. Well might such a man in his last moments, oppressed by a sense of his crimes and cruelties, cry out as he did—"I dare hope that God will look upon me with a merciful eye for all the good I have done to my country."

The military achievements of Peter were varied. He drove the Tártárs and the Turks from the Crimea, which enabled him fully to open out the commerce with Persia through Georgia. His war with Charles XII. of Sweden is well known. The intrepidity and valour of the Swede carried at first everything before him; but Peter stood his ground. "I know well," said he, "that the Swedes will have the advantage of us for a considerable time; but they will teach us at length to beat them." The experience required was gained; his army received that development which it stood in need of; and the royal Swede, defeated at Pultowa, was never able to recover. This gave Russia for the first time political consideration in Europe; and her sovereign was hailed by the potentates of all the neighbouring States by the title of

Emperor. He proved less successful in a war with the Turks, being reduced to a disastrous condition on the banks of the Pruth, from which he was extricated solely by the wit of his wife, who patched up a hasty peace with the Grand Vizier, which set him free. It is said that that wife afterwards, on her intrigue with Moens being discovered, administered poison to him, of which he died. This, however, is by no means probable; it is more generally believed that he sank under the effects of his own debaucheries, being carried off by a venereal distemper for which the pharmacopœia of the age had no remedy.

The reigns of Catherine I., Peter II., Anne, and Elizabeth, do not present any features of particular interest. The last two were entirely governed by their favourites. Anne, ambitious of military glory, trained and fitted her army for European warfare by fighting with the Poles, Tártárs, and Turks. In the reign of Elizabeth the Seven Years' War with Prussia was commenced; but it was not terminated till the time of her nephew, Peter III., who is yet better known for having introduced a great many reforms into Russia. Some of these reforms, however, gave offence to his subjects, and the clergy in particular were scandalised at a mad order threatening their beards. He also incurred the displeasure of his wife, a sensual woman, who, conspiring against him, had him deposed and murdered, after which she ascended the throne herself as Catherine II. At this time morality was unknown in the imperial and aristocratic circles of Russia. Catherine had four or five lovers while her husband was living; after his death their number was counted by hundreds, the empress disdaining to cover her pleasures by a veil. Her personal aide-de-camp was constantly changed, and this

officer always slept in the palace, in an apartment that communicated with that of his sovereign. But, barring this weakness, the rule of Catherine was very vigorous, and historians have justly considered it as the most brilliant chapter in the history of Russia. She was a woman of uncommon abilities, whose active genius replaced Russia in the rank to which Peter I. had momentarily raised her. Her projects were as ambitious as those of Peter; she extended the limits of the empire in every direction, especially towards Constantinople, by annexing the Crimea and the adjacent country, and towards the Caspian. She also renewed with success the intercourse of Russia with China, opened an intercourse with Japan, and established on a salutary footing the trade with Persia. Aspiring to every kind of celebrity, she gave her people a new code of laws, encouraged letters and the arts and sciences amongst them, and did everything to improve their manners and condition, convoking even a general council of deputies, in which representatives from the polar regions met face to face with those from the Crimea and the Caucasus. What her name, however, will best be remembered for is the partition of Poland, which was effected in concert with Prussia and Austria. The idea was that of Maria Theresa, or rather of her minister Kaunitz; but the principal agents to give effect to it were Frederick II. of Prussia and the Czarina. Russia obtained by that transaction an addition of more than two thousand square miles of territory, and one and a half million of subjects. The French Revolution broke out shortly after; but Catherine, though she promised assistance largely, was unable to do anything to suppress it. The fact is, she had aggrandised Russia at the expense of her positive strength; and the consequence was, that towards the close

of her reign the empire got enfeebled, from all its springs having become relaxed and impaired. She had firmness enough to refuse to share the throne with any of her favourites ; but the very circumstance of their personal connection with her had given to scores and hundreds of knaves the option of abusing their influence. The resources of the empire were wasted by these drones, and all kinds of disorder and disorganisation were introduced into the administration. An apoplexy carried off the great Messalina of the north, just when the lustre of her reign had commenced to grow dim. Some have it that she saw her husband's ghost, fell down with a shriek, and expired.

The Emperor Paul, known in history as the mad emperor, succeeded Catherine, and was contemporaneous with Napoleon I. The first league of Paul was with Austria against France ; and four armies advanced at the voice of the autocrat from the confines of Asia to subjugate and crush the republican government. The victory of Marengo, which delivered Italy to France and beat down the power of Austria, changed the sentiments of Paul into an admiration for Napoleon ; and, the arrogation of a right of search on the seas by the British government having given him offence, he entered into an alliance with France for the overthrow of the British power. He also formed a confederation with Sweden, Denmark, and Prussia for the protection of trading-vessels against the right claimed by England. Both the alliance and the confederation were frustrated by the assassination of Paul and Nelson's victory at Copenhagen. The former, Bonaparte insinuated, was brought about by the English Government, from a fear of the combination of Russia with France, and particularly of the preparations made by

the former for attacking India through Persia. "Paul," said the first consul, "died on the night of the 23rd March, the English fleet passed the Sound on the 30th: history will unveil the connection which existed between these events." The calumny, however, did not stick; it was even then well known that the death of Paul was due to the machinations, not of England, but of his own officers, and that the crime was participated in by his son. The number of conspirators was so great that no one was ever punished; and in the reign of Alexander I. many openly boasted of their share in the crime.

The history of Russia now becomes the history of Europe. The four principal events of the reign of Alexander I. were the treaty of Tilsit, the annexation of Finland, the burning of Moscow, and the capitulation of Paris. The elevation of the first consul to the imperial dignity gave rise to the rupture between Russia and France. Bent upon setting bounds to Bonaparte's ambition, Alexander joined Austria to repel his invasions, and shared in the defeat at Austerlitz. Continuing in the war, the Russians were again defeated at Friedland, subsequent to which peace was made between the emperors after a personal conference at Tilsit, where many secret engagements were exchanged for the partition of Europe and the establishment of a duocracy to divide the world between Russia and France. As usual, however, each wanted the lion's share of the prize; and, unable to wait, Alexander marched against Sweden while Napoleon was yet fighting with Austria, took the gallant Gustavus by surprise, and annexed Finland with the whole of East Bothnia and a part of West Bothnia, on the sole pretext that the Swedes had not closed the ports of the Baltic against the English. Equally dexterous and successful

was his policy on the side of Turkey, which he stripped of Bessarabia. He also wanted Wallachia and Moldavia; and, as Napoleon would not allow him to take them, there was a fresh rupture with France, which widened into the campaign of 1812. The march to Moscow, and the voluntary sacrifice of the city, which annihilated the hopes of Napoleon, were incidents unique in the history of the world. The French, who had the best personal knowledge of the sacrifice, have never attempted to imitate the heroism of the Russians, though they might have done so with credit on divers occasions. After her triumph, Russia assumed the protection of Germany, and actually did rescue her from the grasp of Napoleon, who was defeated by the allied armies at Leipsic. France was then entered and Paris occupied, and Napoleon compelled to abdicate and retire to Elba.

The reign of Nicholas was opposed at the outset by an ineffectual insurrection at St. Petersburg, and was afterwards distinguished by a short but successful war with Persia and the annexation of Georgia and Armenia, by the suppression of an insurrection in Poland, and by two wars with Turkey—one in 1828 and the other in 1854, Turkey being assisted on the latter occasion by France, England, and Sardinia, whereby Russia was defeated and Sebastopol taken and destroyed. The origin of this war, as explained by the secret and confidential communications of Russia to England, showed with what pertinacity the imperial government was pursuing its original scheme of aggrandisement, generally attributed to Peter the Great. The sick man was about to die; it was no longer necessary to maintain what did not admit of being propped up; if England would allow the annexation of Turkey by Russia, Russia would leave her at liberty to take

Egypt and Candia. The partition thus proposed was prevented for the time by the war that followed; but Russia is so rapacious and persistent that it is doubtful if it will be prevented long.

The most remarkable feature connected with Russia is the vastness of her territory and the immensity of her population, which is estimated at not less than eighty-two millions, allowing seventy millions for European Russia and twelve millions for Russia in Asia. The preponderance which this gives Russia in the councils of Europe is apparent, since even united Germany does not count numbers so large. But taking each entire empire as a whole, the subjects of Great Britain considerably outnumber even those of Russia, since India alone contains a population of one hundred and ninety-eight millions, of which Bengal holds sixty-seven millions, or a little short of what is owned by the whole of European Russia. Such being the case, it is rather surprising that the variety of races in Russia should be almost as great as the variety in India, though it ought not to be more than one-fifth and a fraction greater than the variety in Bengal. The chief Russian divisions are the Slavs—including the Poles and Cossacks; the Letts; the Finns; the Tártárs—including the Mongols, Mántchoos, and Caucasians; the Samojedes; the Ostraks; and the Armenians: with numerous subdivisions more broadly defined than even the main distinct races of India. The consequence is, that there is greater internal disunion within the Russian Empire than perhaps within any other country either in Europe or Asia, which is only covered by the repressive despotism that rules over the entire domain. The people are absolutely at the mercy of their rulers: they have no intelligence, no aspirations, and no freedom whatever to speak of.

The vastness of Russia has been the result of her position, which left her no alternative but to swallow up all the neighbouring States. The empire of Rurik was confined to a small bit of territory in the north of European Russia. Ivan III. conquered Astrakhán and Kasan; Ivan IV., Siberia; Alexis, the Ukraine; Peter I., most of the Baltic provinces; Catherine II., the western provinces of Lithuania, Podolia, and Volhynia, the southern portion of European Russia down to the Crimea, and a part of the Caucasus; while Alexander I. conquered Finland and Bothnia, and Nicholas added Armenia and Georgia, besides finally subduing the Poles. Over the whole of this territory Russia has now built fortresses and prisons, if not churches and hospitals also; large canals have been excavated; mines opened out; and manufactories established. Latterly, several railways too have been laid down, though a great extent of country is yet devoid of ordinary roads; and to preserve a strong hold on the whole empire, it has been divided into eighty subordinate governments, with a governor over each. The manner in which all this consolidation has been effected has not been altogether blameless; but allowances must be made for the barbarism of the country and the races by which it is peopled. The Americans allot the whole old world to Russia, and very complacently apportion the whole new world to themselves. The wish implied in the division is never likely to fructify. But it fully recognises the importance which Russia has attained, though whether the large extent of her possessions is really of much benefit to her at present is a question that can only be very doubtfully answered.

Over all this vast dominion the emperor is uncontrolled autocrat, an expression which means much more in Russia

than in Germany and Austria. An order of the emperor in either of the latter countries would doubtless be as promptly carried out as in Russia, but in them it would only be carried out by officers holding their places under the government; while in Russia, so great is the fear of the despot from one extremity of the empire to the other, it would be unmurmuringly carried out by the people also, even if it were prejudicial to their interests. The origin of this autocracy is to be traced to Ivan III., who assumed it with a view to break down the authority of the Tártars, and restore peace to an empire that was distracted by petty tyrannies. He was helped in securing it by the people themselves, who suffered most from the state of anarchy that prevailed, and were anxious to find shelter under the imperial wings. It was enormously increased by the lunatic Ivan IV., whose freaks of madness were never attempted to be circumscribed. The edifice was completed by Peter I., who finished by assuming the Pontificate, remarking, as he compared himself with Louis XIV., that, while the latter was under the orders of his priests, he, Peter, was above them. Enormous was the power and enormous the responsibility thus arrogated, but no one ever dreamt of objecting to it. Peter exterminated the Strelitz without one cry of vengeance being raised against him; Catherine II. deposed and assassinated her husband, but was acknowledged as empress by his subjects on bended knees; and yet, such misuse of power would probably not have been as quietly acquiesced in even by the slaves of China and Persia. In the case of Paul I. only, which is of later date than the others, was the idea first admitted that an autocrat when tyrannous might be opposed and killed. But, even in that instance, the idea would never have arisen save

for the connivance of the son in his father's murder ; and, after all, it was his nobles who killed him—there was no complaint against him from the people. The people throughout the history of the country are always seen as supporting the emperor's autocracy, which has shielded them at all times from the oppressions of the nobility, and the ill effects of which do not directly affect them. Hence the myth that the Czar is regarded as the father of his people ; his power certainly is never questioned. Petty revolts of the people have occurred at times, but against the officers of the State, not against the imperial power.

• “The Russian nobility,” as Paul I. described it to the French ambassador, “consists of those persons only to whom the Czar speaks ; and they are great only so long as he does speak to them.” The first aristocracy of Russia was composed of the followers of Rurik. The nobles of ducal blood were the personal relations of the sovereign and their progeny ; the rest of the nobility being made up of military chiefs, who were called “boyars” and “voivodes” by the Slavs, from the terms “boi,” meaning a battle, and “voijvoda,” the leader of an army. When the custom of dividing the territories of the principality into appanages was adopted, the power of the nobility of the first grade was enormously increased ; but, on the unity of the empire being re-established by Ivan III., the princely houses were reduced to an equality with the other nobles, and all registered promiscuously in the national peerage. The official nobility of Russia was created by Peter I., and up to the reign of Peter III. no one was admitted into the aristocracy who had not served the Crown in a military or civil capacity, which necessarily made it compulsory on all hereditary nobles to take ser-

vice ; but, since then, such compulsion has not been held imperative, except in imminent need, when all the nobility are expected to turn out. The classes now are : hereditary nobles, who do not enter the service unless they wish it, and official nobles, who are such only for the appointments they hold. Of the former the authority is entirely nominal, and the people show them no respect. The latter constitute a bureaucracy, and, acting in concert, retain all the power and patronage of the government in their hands. The original rights of the aristocracy included the privilege of holding serfs, the option of entering the public service, and exemption from the payment of taxes and from corporal punishment. The first of these privileges has since been taken away, and the position of the nobleman who has no official status has necessarily become insignificant. It would have been absolutely so if the aristocracy did not include all the educated men in the country. In the past the nobles joined in many movements which gave trouble ; but these consisted of conspiracies and murders : there was never any attempt made by them at constitutional resistance. What they are now particularly famous for is their official corruption. "The only person," said Nicholas, "who is not a thief in my dominions is myself."

The government of Russia is strictly absolute, and entirely arbitrary. It is administered by a Council of the Empire, which has charge of all measures relating to home policy ; a Directing Senate, which promulgates and watches over the execution of imperial enactments ; and a Holy Synod, which attends to all ecclesiastical affairs. Over all these the emperor presides, either personally or by proxy ; and he is at all times at liberty to

annul their decisions by an exercise of his will. The Council of the Empire consists of the princes and statesmen of the country, and the number of its members is necessarily indefinite. The Directing Senate is formed of the three first classes of the State, and comprises one hundred members ; but the people are not represented in it. The third assembly is entirely composed of clergymen, but, in the time of Nicholas, was presided over by a general of cavalry ! The ministerial functions of the empire are performed by ministries, which are eleven in number, and are subdivided into special sections and departments. They act independently of each other, and directly under the emperor's orders, but nevertheless form together a board of government which is named the Council of Ministers.

The people in Russia have no voice in the government : nay, till recently, had no voice even in their own affairs. The Slavs, who formed the basis and heart of the nation in European Russia, were originally free. The Varangians, or Russi, came and changed their laws and institutions ; but they were too few in number to reduce them to serfs. The position of the peasants in Russia up to the time of Ivan IV. was the same as in other countries generally. They were free, and worked either as farmers or as hired servants. It was Feodar who first prohibited the employment of hired servants ; and Boris Godunof, in improving on the idea, enacted, in the interests of the peasants, that they should not be liable to arbitrary expulsion from the soil. This was intended to check the tyranny of the wealthy boyars ; but it eventually led to the servitude of the peasants. By a subsequent ordinance it was ruled that servants who worked by contract should not be allowed to quit their masters ; and the operation

of the two orders together reduced thousands and thousands of freemen to bondage to the soil. What was left unfinished by Boris was accomplished by Peter I., who made estates hereditary, and bound the serfs to their proprietors. Of course the serfs rose constantly against their masters, many of whom were killed; it was not in human nature to submit to such arrangements without a protest: but all their opposition only riveted the chains more strongly on them, till they got brutalised by habit and ceased to struggle. Alexis and Catherine II. were the only two sovereigns who thought of emancipating the peasants, but they were not able to effect it. Nicholas attempted to alleviate their miseries; but his object was misunderstood, and led to a servile revolt. The Gordian knot was subsequently cut through by Alexander II., by a general liberation of the serfs. It is said that that has not benefited them—that, on the contrary, it has much increased drunkenness amongst them, and made them improvident; but this is probably a one-sided representation. It has made the sovereign more popular than the autocrat of all the Russias ever was, notwithstanding all the deference he was accustomed to receive. His power now is based on the interests of his people: he is master of men who believe that all their prospects of safety and security rest in him, and in him alone. When they are better educated, their hopes and aspirations may take a different turn; and it is said that a strong desire for intellectual improvement is already developing itself among them. It may, nevertheless, be taken for granted that for a long time to come the power of the Czar over them is not likely to diminish.

The civilisation of Russia is of recent growth, and dates from the time when St. Petersburg was founded,

which enabled her to hold direct communication with Europe. Only a hundred and sixty years ago she had no possessions on either the Baltic or the Black Sea, and was necessarily nothing but an Asiatic power. Peter I. completed the arrangements which made her a European power, and established free communication between her and the civilised States ; and since then she has not only founded all her political institutions on the European model, but has established a thriving trade, and expanded a suddenly-created navy. Even her wars with the western nations have been of benefit to her in refining her manners and conferring on her the first rudiments of practical and useful education. In the Crimean war the humanity shown to the wounded on the battle-field by the allies was a new lesson to the descendants of the Cossacks and Tártárs, which they would not otherwise have acquired in half a century. They also learned from the war their immense need of railways and telegraphs ; and, accepting the lesson loyally, have already benefited by it, by introducing both broadcast throughout their extensive dominions. These improvements have been supplemented by irrigation and the cultivation of the useful arts, by means of which the resources of the country have been largely increased within the last twenty-nine years, and her commerce widely extended.

At this moment the external commerce of Russia is divided into two main branches, one being her commerce with the nations of Europe, the other her commerce with the nations of Asia ; the first of which is carried on for ready-money and on credit as represented by bills of exchange, the other by barter or exchange of goods without credit in any shape. Her Asiatic commerce is chiefly carried on at Astrakhán and other ports of the Caspian,

besides which she has depôts even up to the frontiers of China, which are daily increasing in number. But Russia is not satisfied with this success, nor was it to be expected that she would be. As compared with her bulk, her trade is yet in its infancy, particularly her sea-traffic, which is represented by some two thousand and five hundred sea-going vessels only; and in other respects her improvements have been less. In letters and polity she has yet a name to establish: she has no poets, no philosophers, no historians whom she can point to with pride; no men of science, no artists, not even any great captains or statesmen. Stories and tales are the principal branches of Russian literature at this moment; wit and poetry have been so little appreciated, that, as a rule, they have invariably been exiled to Siberia. Of late reviews and magazines have been started, which are generally rather ably conducted, and promise to become useful in the interests of popular education. As for religion, Russia embraced the Greek faith at the command of Vladimir. The Eastern Empire was already tottering to its fall when this change was adopted. The Greek Church was bad enough then; it cannot be said that the Russian Church has become much better since. But great are the efforts now being made to enlighten the people; and this at least may be conceded, that Western Russia is no longer the Tártár she was.

What Russia has chiefly directed her attention to is her army and navy. It would have been better if she had done so less; but it is said that she has a career chalked out for her which she is pledged to realise. The authenticity of Peter's Will has not been established. The 9th clause of the document known as such runs thus: "We must progress as much as possible in the

direction of Constantinople and India. He who can get possession of those points is the real ruler of the world. With this view we must provoke constant quarrels—at one time with Turkey, at another with Persia. We must establish wharves and docks in the Euxine, and by degrees make ourselves masters of that sea as well as of the Baltic, which is a doubly important element in our plan. We must hasten the downfall of Persia; push on to the Persian Gulf; if possible re-establish the ancient commercial intercourse with the Levant through Syria, and force our way to the Indies, which are the storehouses of the world.” This document, if genuine, was executed in 1725, or long before the English became masters of India, when the possibility of carrying out the idea in that direction was not hopeless. As the case now stands, great indeed must be the power that is able to achieve it; and it is more than probable that no one has ever really thought of it but Paul I., the madman.

What Russia does actually want is sufficiently intelligible, and it is an idea of Peter the Great that she is anxious to carry out. Russia has been and still is an Asiatic power, and she naturally seeks dominion over as much of Asia as she can acquire and hold. The mission of civilisation is not, as has been most uncharitably supposed, a blind to cover a greed for territorial aggrandisement. It is a matter-of-course sequence which Russia could not avoid even if she desired to do so. Russia does seek, plainly and undisguisedly, the overthrow of all native rule in Central Asia. Her first conquests there began with the subjugation of Kasan, in 1487, and they have since been uniformly continued for nearly four hundred years. A methodical direction was given to them

by Peter the Great, who, having visited Astrakhán in 1722, perceived that the gate to the Asiatic countries was through the land of the Khirgis; and from that time to this the efforts to expand through the Khirgis have been incessant. There is no mistake as to the policy followed. The majority of the Khirgis steppés are now under Russian rule, and, from 1847, the policy of founding permanent forts all over the conquered tract has been uniformly pursued. Just as England secured outposts all over the seas before asserting her proud pre-eminence over them, Russia is slowly but surely securing outposts all over Central Asia, where she will shortly be in a position to declare herself. But with the power of Russia her civilisation also is developing in the countries subjugated or brought under control by her. England did not go out to civilise India. First commerce, then conquest, and last diffusion of knowledge and the useful arts have followed; and such precisely is the Russian policy without a blind. One main difference pointed out as existing between Russia and England in Asia is this, that while the government of the former is a military one, that of the latter is a civil one; but the difference is more nominal than real, for England also holds India by the sword.

It would have been better if England alone had been the civiliser of all Asia, instead of having Russia for her coadjutor. But it cannot be so, since England has plenty of other work on her hands in her colonies, and all her energies would not suffice for both duties being well performed. Her civilisation, also, is not exactly what would best suit the present condition of Asia generally. In a reign of above a hundred and twenty-five years in India, she has not been able to make any decisive impression on the people, except, at an immense interval, on the Pársees and

the Bengalis. Russian civilisation, though much lower than that of England, is better understood and more easily adopted by semi-barbarous tribes. The exalted ideas of freedom, the ceaseless yearning for progress which distinguish the Briton, are hard, very hard lessons for the Asiatics to master. The civilisation of Russia is more compromising. It will not destroy native habits and ideas, but gradually transform them. The Englishman will carry his roast-beef and beer-bottle with him, and try to force them along with his notions of improvement. The Russian is an Asiatic himself, and will share the *chuppáti* of the Hindu, and drink *charná-metro* with the Vysnub, and so induce them to come over to his side. Even conservative China communicates with Russia, and has done so for ages, though she kept the English at a distance as long as she could do so with impunity. As has been correctly observed by some one, the Asiatic, to become a European, must first be converted into a Russian. It would seem, therefore, that Central Asia has been designedly assigned by Providence to the charge of Russia for its amelioration, just as India has been especially made over to England, as having already a higher civilisation than Russia can impart, and which would therefore benefit better, though more slowly, under English rule.

Need England quarrel, then, with Russia with reference to Central Asian affairs? If so, wherefore? The geographical position of Russia throws upon her the onus of conquering and civilising the native States of Asia. England cannot prevent this, any more than Russia can prevent her from colonising Australasia and Canada. Nor ought she to attempt to do it, since the progress of Russia in Asia has certainly been to the advantage of Asia. It is not in

the power of Russia to take India, nor will she ever be so fool-hardy as to attempt it. An attack on India is not possible even with the aid of the Afgháns ; and the chance of Afghánistán becoming a Russian dependency, or in any way subservient to Russian interests, is a very distant contingency to speculate upon. The Afgháns will never be as easily brought under as the other races of Central Asia ; and, should any attempt to subjugate them be made, the issue, with the assistance of British troops and British money to back them, need not be doubted. Of course, if Russia and England make up their minds to fight, a war can be got up ; but that there is any necessity for it on one side or the other is not apparent. There is no reason whatever why England should not be able to form that definite and trustworthy alliance with Russia which would give Asia a century of development and peace. In the natural progress of things the Russian and the British territories may touch, though not in the direction of Afghánistán ; but even that is no reason why they should quarrel.

Let us now see what the wants of Russia are, and we shall be able to understand what she actually aims at. Russia has no sea-room for her commerce and her navy ; the world's great ocean is virtually closed to her ; no sufficiently wide gateway has she for her supplies ; no broad range for her ships of war. The Northern Ocean, of which she has the whole sea-board, is blocked up by ice ; the Baltic can at any time be blocked up by a few ships of war ; the Black Sea has no outlet for her except under an enemy's guns, and to a sea where the English flag is all-powerful. This is a position to which no great nation can willingly submit, and it is not in the power of England, or of any other country, to force Russia to continue in it.

We may take it for granted, then, that her eye is on Persia; that she wants access both to the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean. She has already cleared her way for this at all costs, and will declare herself as soon as she can find an opportunity to do so. From Astrabád to Herát, and from Herát to Persia, a regular army has an open way to go by; whereas in the Indian direction it would have to traverse Afghánistán, never easily accessible of itself.

But Russia wants something more than Persia. She wants, at the same time, to settle the Eastern question for good; to subvert the Mahomedan power in Turkey and Persia at one blow. This would not be a loss to England or to the world, nor could England prevent its consummation alone. In 1854, the war against Russia was waged by four distinct nations allied together. Two of those powers would not be able to afford the same assistance now if the question were reopened, as they have enough to do with their own affairs at home; and, if Russia could create difficulties for England in India, the problem as regards Turkey would solve of itself, unless Germany were found willing to take up the position which France occupied on the previous occasion. It is no slur on England—a naval power—that she cannot check the progress of Russia alone on land; and there are many reasons why she should not attempt to do so. The enmity of Russia may convulse India again as she was convulsed during the Sepoy Mutiny, possibly not without Russian cognisance. There is no reason whatever for risking this for what England cannot prevent. England's safest course, therefore, is to let Russia have her own way, for that would make Russia absolutely harmless so far as purely English interests are concerned. The army of Russia is one of the strongest in Europe, though essentially not so powerful

by organisation and discipline as it is in numbers. She wants to develop her fleet to a similar extent—a mad idea, for the Russian will never make a sailor. But the whim may safely be allowed to take its course. England will not suffer in the slightest degree by Russia cleaving out her way through Constantinople to the Mediterranean, or through Persia to the Indian Ocean. The latter is, perhaps, at this moment as near to accomplishment as Russia herself could wish. It may possibly necessitate the maintenance by England of an additional force of about fifteen thousand men on the banks of the Indus, and a larger navy than she has at present in the Indian Ocean, for the protection of India and Australasia.

As yet Russia is not proceeding directly towards Persia, for there is no reason why she should reveal her design before the right moment. It is even supposed by some that China is the real object of the Russian advance in Asia. For purposes of trade China has been open to Russia ever since Siberia was acquired in the reign of Ivan IV. She now threatens her more immediately from the west, but perhaps still only to acquire a commercial preponderance. It may, of course, be otherwise. The Muscovite is not unlikely to have more than one string to his bow. He will take China gladly if he can get her, but of that the certainty is not so great as of the conquest of Persia. An army of fifty thousand Russians would walk through Persia with ease; an army of one hundred thousand Russians might do the same through China. But an army of two hundred thousand men would in all probability never cross the Indus. It is true that India has been repeatedly invaded and conquered from the north-west, and so it might be again if her geographical defences only had to be overcome, and if the old conditions

of her position and the old methods of warfare could be revived. The equipment of modern armies renders it perfectly impossible to convey the materials of war through long deserts and difficult mountains; and, while the invaders would necessarily be without such materials on their arrival in India, they would find the defenders amply provided with them. The European army in India, though small, is one of the most highly-finished instruments of war in the world; and, taking India by herself, without reference to any extraneous assistance she could, or could not, receive, England is there strong enough to defy any power that Russia could bring to bear on her. The European army of Russia has enough to do in watching the armies of Prussia and Austria, and no portion of it could be withdrawn, even during the profoundest peace in Europe. In Asia she has in all about two hundred thousand troops; and these are fully employed in keeping down the warlike population of Central Asia, now held by her under subjection. Not more than twenty thousand men of this army are available for offensive purposes; and very extraordinary measures could do no more than double or treble that number. Of course Russia could, if she wished it, increase her forces by drawing on the innumerable nomad hordes of Asia. But, in the first place, it is doubtful if those hordes would not themselves form her chief enemies; and, even if they were friendly to her, such undisciplined levies would only act as a dead weight on her. Britain, on her side, has an inexhaustible store of military races in India to draw upon; and, if half a century more intervenes before the rupture breaks out, India will have become too strongly consolidated for the whole of Russia—European and Asiatic taken together—to make the slightest impression on her.

All that Russia could do in India, therefore, virtually resolves itself to this : she could stir up troubles against the English by exciting mutiny and rebellion. But that is a game which two can play at ; and the hold of Russia in Central Asia is certainly more insecure than the hold of Great Britain on India. The purse of England can do more. There are plenty of combustible materials throughout the Russian Empire. Poland still sighs for the liberty she has lost ; the Cossacks hate the Russian rule ; the Circassians still dream of independence ; even the Siberians are not well reconciled to their condition. It is therefore in the power of England to raise a tempest in Russia, which all the strength of the northern giant may not be able to allay.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE MINOR STATES OF EUROPE.

THE remaining States of Europe do not require such lengthened notice as we have given to the primary powers. Some of them, it is true, have had their eras of greatness, especially Spain, Portugal, and Holland; but their present weakness and imbecility are too great to hold out any promise of a very brilliant career in the future, and a brief allusion to their past will therefore fully suffice for that comprehensive view of the whole world which we are anxious to furnish. The best phases of their existence have long disappeared; with the exception of Italy, not one of them is making any particular exertion to recover lost ground; no anticipations for the future arise in reading of them. Though belonging to the modern world, they are already of the past.

Denmark, Sweden, and Norway.

In the north of Europe are the States of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, which were originally known by the general name of Scandinavia, which has a very interesting history of its own. The Swedes and the Danes trace their descent from Noah to Odin, and the Norwegians from Noah to Thor; but the accounts they give are based on tradition only, a fair part of which may nevertheless be true.

Odin, according to Saxo-Grammaticus, was a king of the Hellespont, and apparently a Scythian, who proceeded in the direction of Germany and Scandinavia immediately after the fall of Troy. The aborigines of Scandinavia before this period were a few Lapps and Finns, who, from this time forward, were frequently overrun by immigrants from the south, the best known among whom were the Cimbri and the Goths. The people derived from a mixture of these races began to make themselves inconveniently known to their neighbours in the early ages of the Christian era by their piracies at sea. They were divided into tribes, each of which formed itself into a distinct community, subject to its own Jarl. The lands held by them were poor, and they had little disposition for either agriculture or trade; the whole of their life, therefore, was devoted to maritime expeditions. The age was that of giants and magicians, and of deeds of great hardihood and valour; and the traditions of the race are replete with accounts of both. In the ninth century, Denmark was formed into a regular government by Gorm I., and Norway by Harold Haarfager (the fair-haired), who became their first kings respectively. Sweden was later in adopting a similar organisation, which she received from Eric, in 1001. But these changes did not give general satisfaction, and many of the pirate chiefs, embarking in their own ships, went away in disgust to Iceland, and the Farøe, Shetland, and Orkney isles, whence they annually ravaged the coasts of their old country; while others contented themselves by periodical depredations on the coasts of Britain and France. In Britain these invaders were best known as Danes, in France as Northmen or Normans, names which were regarded with equal terror in both countries. They also

extended their power eastward, on the coasts of the Baltic, where they were known by the name of Varangians ; and, after establishing themselves in Russia, passed down to Byzantium, where, for a long period, the Varangian guard of the emperor was the most faithful support of his throne.

Christianity was introduced into Denmark between the eighth and ninth centuries, and was extended thence to Sweden and Norway. In the eleventh century, Denmark and Norway were united under the rule of Canute the Great, who also reigned over England, which had been conquered by his father Sweyn. In the fourteenth century, the race of Odin in Sweden became extinct, and the ancient dynasties of Denmark and Norway ended at the same time in the person of a female named Margaret Waldemar, known as the Semiramis of the North, who, conquering Sweden, united the three kingdoms into one empire, an amalgamation which did not outlast her life. The kingdoms of Norway and Denmark remained united down to the nineteenth century ; but Sweden, refusing to accept the German dynasty that was established in them after the death of Margâret, seceded from the union and set up a distinct king for herself, her independence being finally established by Gustavus Vasa, in 1523. The Protestant religion was introduced into Sweden during the reign of this prince, who also succeeded in laying the foundation of that greatness which the country was able shortly after to attain. His grandson, Gustavus Adolphus, raised the martial reputation of the Swedes to a point which it had never reached before. He was invited by the Protestant princes of Germany to place himself at their head and oppose the scheme of Austria to restore the supremacy of the Pope over Christendom ; and his career of glory fully justified the choice.

He fell at the battle of Lützen; but the statesmen and generals brought up in his school were quite able to sustain the success he had secured, till the 'Thirty Years' War was terminated by the peace of Westphalia, from which period Sweden, from being an obscure State in Europe, assumed a foremost place.

The reign of Charles X. was also glorious, though he was obliged to relinquish many of his conquests by a confederacy formed against him by Denmark, Russia, and Germany: it was the madness of Charles XII. that plunged Sweden neck-deep in ruin. The military talents of this sovereign were of the highest order, and he led his people to a succession of triumphs by crushing his enemies with a rapidity which can only be compared with the conquests of Napoleon I. a hundred years later. But, becoming intoxicated with success, he determined to conquer Russia, which caused the destruction of his splendid army at Pultowa, and shattered the national power. After his death the Swedish crown became elective, but was again made hereditary under Charles XIII.; and, on his dying without heirs, Marshal Bernadotte, one of the ablest generals of the French Republic, was chosen to succeed him. In 1812, the Swedes under Bernadotte joined the coalition against Napoleon, and did good service during the campaign of 1813-14, which was rewarded at the general pacification of Europe by the gift of Norway wrested from Denmark. The glorious eras of Gustavus Vasa and Gustavus Adolphus have never been renewed in their country; but its resources have since been largely developed, and the condition of the people greatly ameliorated, and more peace and prosperity have been enjoyed under the dynasty of Bernadotte than at any previous period. The present govern-

ment is monarchical, but controlled by a diet, consisting of two chambers, both elected by the people, and representing all classes—namely, the nobility, clergy, burgesses, and peasants. The religion is Protestant; great attention is paid all over the country to the education of the people; and the press is free. The intellect of the nation has been vindicated by the names of Puffendorf, Tycho Brahe, Linnæus, Berzelius, Geyer, and many others equally distinguished. In most of the large towns there are extensive libraries; and there are also first-class literary and scientific societies in the country, though of very unostentatious character.

The history of Denmark makes little noise in Europe after the reign of Margaret Waldemar. In 1448, a German dynasty was established on the throne in the person of Christian I., when Sleswig and Holstein were annexed to Denmark. We all know how violently they have since been disunited from her. But, perhaps, the greatest injury she has received from any power was that inflicted on her by England, in 1807, when the Danish fleet was destroyed by Nelson to prevent its falling into the hands of Bonaparte. It was after that that Norway was forcibly wrested from her to be given away to Sweden, which completed her reduction and humiliation. Notwithstanding these inflictions, the national spirit in Denmark has been reawakened; and, if England will only make amends for the past and countenance the Danes with her support, they may yet establish a name and consolidate their power in the future, the opportunity for which may shortly arise. The government of Denmark is monarchical, with a *Rigsdag*, or diet, composed of a senate and a house of commons, to advise the Crown. The people are simple-minded, contented, and honest.

Nowhere has more been done for the extension of popular education. The authors of Denmark also occupy an honourable position.

Norway has no history apart from the history of Denmark and Sweden. It was ceded to Sweden by the treaty of Kiel, in 1814, but stoutly stood out for its independence notwithstanding the union. Oscar I. afterwards gave to it a separate flag, and also decreed that in all acts and public documents relating to Norway the king was to be called King of Norway and Sweden, and not of Sweden and Norway, as had previously been the practice ; and with these concessions the Norwegians have been well satisfied. The relative rights of the king and the people were defined by the Grundlov, or the constitution given to the country at the time of its annexation with Sweden. The Storthing, an elective assembly, represents the governed in the administration of their country. It has two houses, the upper and the common, the latter of which initiates all enactments. There is no hereditary nobility in Norway. The religion is Protestant, and remains exactly in the state it was in when Catholicism was subverted by Luther. The education of the people is not of a high standard ; but it is rare to find any one in Norway who is unable to read and write. The people are very hospitable, and, as a rule, very partial to agricultural pursuits.

Holland and Belgium.

The next States to notice, as we run downwards, are Holland and Belgium, known in the past by the name of the Netherlands, from their situation at the mouths of the Rhine, the Meuse, and the Scheldt, and from their

being protected by dykes and embankments from the sea. They were originally occupied by the Celts, being afterwards acquired by the Franks and the Saxons, the latter of whom formed the bulk of the population in the maritime provinces. In the time of Charlemagne the whole territory was annexed to France, but subsequently became independent under its several chiefs, known as the Counts of Flanders, Hainault, Brabant, and Holland, at about the same time that the Germans elected a separate emperor for themselves. The States very early grew wealthy by trade. The swampy and unproductive nature of their soil led the inhabitants to collect into cities for mutual assistance, and these acquired power and privileges which very much increased their importance. The principal cities were: Bruges, Ghent, Brussels, Antwerp, and Liege; and also Leyden and Amsterdam, which were of later growth. Many efforts were made to suppress them, but these were generally unsuccessful.

In the fourteenth century, Philip, Duke of Burgundy, became possessed of the entire territory, partly by conquest and partly by inheritance; and from the house of Burgundy it was transferred to that of Austria on the marriage of Mary, the daughter of Charles the Bold, with Maximilian, who became Emperor of Germany, in 1493. In the time of Charles V. the States were in a very flourishing condition, and the great towns were the chief marts of Northern Europe. They were also the centres of civilisation in that age, excelling not only in manufactures, but likewise in literature and the arts. The paintings of the Flemish school were particularly celebrated; and societies for the cultivation of poetry were formed in every town. The Reformation too made ex-

tensive progress in them, which gave particular offence to Philip II. of Spain when he obtained the Netherlands in succession to Charles. He disliked equally the people and their new faith, and, determining to subdue the one and suppress the other, sent the Duke of Alva as governor, with a large army to carry out his designs. The cruelties perpetrated by Alva were execrable: the Inquisition was established by him to enforce the Catholic religion, and eighteen thousand prisoners were delivered over to the executioner within a space of six years for daring to resist its authority. But the severity of his measures defeated the end held in view by him. The people were exasperated, and made a desperate opposition, which was headed by the Dukes of Egmont and Horn, and the Prince of Orange. First Holland, and then Zealand, cast off the Spanish yoke; and, by 1579, a union was effected by seven provinces—namely, Holland, Zealand, Utrecht, Friesland, Groningen, Overysse, and Guelderland, under the designation of the Seven United Provinces—and their sovereignty offered first to Elizabeth of England, and, on her refusing it, to the Duke of Anjou. The war with Spain was in the meantime continued with great spirit, and in the prosecution of it the States were vigorously assisted by the English, till, after a contest of thirty-seven years, Spain was obliged to acknowledge their independence in 1609, when they accepted the government of a Council of Deputies, with a chief, or Stadtholder, at its head to exercise the executive power.

During the conflict with Spain the United Provinces increased greatly in wealth, acquired extensive provinces in the East, and formed a strong navy. They continued, however, to be internally disturbed by religious dissensions, and externally from having sided with France in

her wars with Spain. They also got involved in disputes with England, in connection with the commercial enterprises carried on by both in the East; and it was in the prosecution of this war that a Dutch fleet sailed up the Thames and burned several English ships at Chatham. The ambition of Louis XIV. subsequently set the whole of Europe ablaze, closing all minor differences for the time; and the Dutch, his immediate neighbours, were so hard pressed, that they intended at one time to leave their country and settle in their possessions in the East. This was rendered unnecessary by the valour and ability of their Stadtholder, William of Orange, afterwards King of England; and, on his accession to the English throne, the Dutch were joined by the English, and fought together till the power of Louis was annihilated.

All this time the western provinces of the Netherlands, which had retained the Catholic religion, had remained under the allegiance of Spain. They were transferred to the house of Austria by the peace of Utrecht, in 1713, being afterwards annexed to France during the wars of the Revolution, when Holland, under the name of the Batavian Republic, declared herself to be the inseparable ally of France. In the time of Napoleon I. the Republic was first changed into a monarchy under his brother Louis, and afterwards, on Louis's abdication, annexed to France. The United Provinces were thus entirely ruined, till, after the fall of Napoleon, the whole of the Netherlands were again formed into one State by the Allies, and placed under the King of Holland, with the title of the King of Belgium. The object of this arrangement was the formation of a solid bulwark against the ambition of France. But the elements put together were heterogeneous and did not adhere, which gave rise to a conflict

of interests, and, expelling the Dutch from their country, the Belgians became independent, in 1830. The two divisions of the Netherlands have since remained distinct. The people of both are famed for their great perseverance and mercantile good faith, but they do not cut any important figure now in the history of the world. Both Holland and Belgium have copied the English system of government best—better than any other country in Europe except Italy. In Holland the whole legislative authority is vested in a Parliament composed of two chambers, called the States-General, while the executive authority is exercised by the king, aided by a responsible council of ministers. In Belgium all authority is vested conjointly in the king, a chamber of representatives, and the senate; the members of both houses being chosen by the people.

Switzerland.

Switzerland is the centre of the high Alps lying between the confines of Germany, France, and Italy, where the largest rivers of Europe take their rise, and where inaccessible valleys are surrounded by rocks which render the place impregnable by nature. This country was known to ancient Rome as the home of the Helvetians; and, in the later migration of nations, was overrun by the Alemanni, the Burgundians, and the Longobards. These three races were afterwards united under the sceptre of France; and, on the division of the French monarchy, Switzerland became a part of the kingdom of Burgundy. According to the prevailing system of the times, it was broken up under the feudal law into a number of petty baronies, amidst which several free towns

enjoyed political consideration, especially those in the bosom of the mountains, which were called forest-cities, and were known by the names of Schwytz, Uri, and Unterwalden.

The most powerful of the Swiss barons were the Counts of Hapsburg; and when one of them, Rodolph, was elected Emperor of Germany, the greater part of Switzerland owned allegiance to him, and in that way became a part of the possessions of Austria, which Rodolph acquired as the distinct appanage of his family. This eventually led to the entire separation and independence of Switzerland. Albert, the son of Rodolph, not content with the possession of that portion of Switzerland which had voluntarily joined Austria, tried to force the forest-cantons also into obedience, and placed over them tyrannical governors, who by their oppressions drove the people to rebellion. The story of Tell and Gesler's hat has been referred to. The first to renounce Austrian authority were the cantons of Uri, Schwytz, and Unterwalden. They were afterwards joined by the cantons of Lucerne, Zurich, Berne, Zug, Glaris, Friburg, Soleure, Basle, Schaffhausen, and Appenzel. Leopold, the son of Albert, attempting to re-enforce their submission at the head of an army, was defeated with great slaughter at Morgarten, after which the independence of Switzerland was recognised.

The arrogant pretensions of Hagenbach, the Burgundian governor of Alsace, involved the Swiss subsequently in a war with Charles the Bold. But a proud consciousness of their power and liberty made the mountaineers more than a match for that leader of armies, who was thrice successively defeated by them, at Granson, Marten, and Nancy, and killed in the last engagement, after which his dominions were dismembered. Two further attempts to

reduce the Swiss were made by the house of Austria, in 1386 and 1389 respectively, the first of which was defeated by the battle of Sempach—one of the most glorious in the records of liberty—and the second, by the battle of Næfels. Austria, humbled by these reverses, sold off her estates in Switzerland to the Swiss, after which the confederated cantons began to develop more fully, till quarrels arose among themselves. In one of these the French, siding with the State of Zurich against the rest, were signally defeated near St. James on the Birs, their success leaving the mountaineers for some time at peace, from which they largely benefited. During the revolutionary wars Switzerland was invaded and occupied by the French, in 1798, her old constitution subverted, and a new constitution given to her with the title of the Helvetic Republic. Next, Bonaparte made her a province of France; but she regained her independence on the occupation of Paris by the Allies, and resumed her former system of government.

Since then Switzerland has well cultivated the arts of peace. Her practical improvements in the culture of the soil have been only surpassed by her improvements in the culture of the mind. The learned establishments in Switzerland are many, and are respected throughout all Europe. The national religion is Protestantism, as it was understood and expounded by Zwingle; but in some places, especially in Geneva, the prevalent faith is that of Calvin. The national character has also improved. The system of sending out the youths of the country as mercenaries into foreign service, obtained for a long time after the defensive wars were terminated, and almost made the terms "Swiss" and "hireling" synonymous. The bulk of the people have now awakened to higher and better-directed aspirations. Invention and enterprise

have opened out new paths of advancement to them, and the progress of industry has been very considerable. The government is republican, each canton being represented by its own deputies ; and in some respects the form is better—that is, less open to corruption—than that of the United States.

Spain.

We now come to the southern provinces of Europe, and commence with Spain and Portugal, which outflank the continent on the west. Spain was originally inhabited by the Celts and the Iberians, who were conquered by the Carthaginians, from whom the country was taken by the Romans. On the destruction of the Roman Empire it was overrun by the Vandals, the Suevi, and the Alans, and finally by the Visigoths, who settled in it in 410, and embraced the Catholic faith. The first monarch of all Spain was Leuvigild. A large portion of the history of this period is made up of usurpations and murders, which, with the freedom of the kingdom for a long time from foreign wars, contributed greatly to its internal weakness. In the reign of Roderick, an usurper, Count Julian, governor of Ceuta and Andalusia, who sided with the rightful heirs, and had an injury of his own—the violation of his daughter by Roderick—to avenge, invited over the Saracens, or Moors, from Africa. The invaders were led by Tárik, after whom Gibraltar—*Djebel-el-Tárik*, or the Rock of Tárik—is named ; and they defeated Roderick, who was drowned in the Guadalquivir. Tárik then scoured through the country, which submitted to him without resistance ; and he did not stop till he beheld the Bay of Biscay. His chief in Africa, Musá, came over next, and completed the subjugation of the rest of the

kingdom, with the exception of Asturias, where a valiant remnant of the Goths defended themselves under Pelayo, against the Moorish power.

The first Saracen governors of Spain were officers of the Kaliphs of Bagdad, of the house of Ommiyáh; and one of these passed the Pyrenees and penetrated into France, which he actually conquered from the Garonne to the Rhone, but whence he was subsequently expelled by Charles Martel, and killed in his flight. When the Ommiyade Kaliphs were deposed, one member of the family, Abder Rahmán, escaping from Africa into Spain, was proclaimed king, in 755; and his descendants continued to rule in Spain for nearly two centuries, and, when all Europe was sunk in darkness, they patronised the sciences and the arts, and diffused civilisation and refinement from the headquarters they had established. The internal disputes of the Moors were the only cause of their decline. The emirs, rebelling against the authority of the kings, established little independent kingdoms for themselves, which diminished the royal power; and the Christians of Asturias, taking advantage of their disputes, gradually extended their possessions from the mountains to the plains. The kingdoms thus formed were Leon, Castile, Arragon, Catalonia, and Navarre. For a long time, however, the Moors were able, with constant reinforcements from Africa, to retain possession of the rest of the country—that is, all to the south of the mountains of Castile.

The wars between the Christians and the Moors excited in both parties the lofty and chivalrous spirit for which the residents of Spain were for a long time famous. Gradually, the Christian States gained ground, while the Mahomedan States lost it, till by the middle of the thir-

teenth century the Moors were limited to Granada and Murcia, which they were able to keep mainly on account of the internal wars and jealousies raging among the Christians. This continued to the end of the fifteenth century, when, Ferdinand of Arragon having married Isabella, Queen of Castile, those two monarchies were united into one kingdom, which began gradually to absorb the other States. Navarre only passed continually by females to France, notwithstanding which, a great portion of it was annexed to Arragon.

It was during the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella that Granada was taken after ten years of incessant warfare, which finally closed a conflict of eight centuries, and obtained for Ferdinand the title of "Father of the Spanish monarchy." The era was also famous for the discovery of America by Columbus, through the patronage of Isabella. But simultaneous with these achievements was the establishment of the Inquisition in Castile, a tribunal which sat in secret upon all persons suspected of disbelieving the Roman Catholic religion, and which first directed its operations against the Jews. It was the erection of this tribunal, and the close connection it maintained with the throne, that contributed most to the decline of Spain. In the reign of Charles V. of Germany and I. of Spain, Cortez and Pizarro conquered the empires of Mexico and Peru with a degree of heroism and cruelty which were equally astounding, both of which very soon reacted on the national character, by raising it in one direction and degrading it in another.

The successor of Charles on the Spanish throne was Philip II., who sent the Invincible Armada against England, and spent much blood and treasure in supporting the Catholics of France. In his reign the Netherlands

were lost to Spain, and also most of the Spanish possessions in the East. His successor, Philip III., expelled the Moriscoes, or Mahomedan population, from Spain, whereby a million of very industrious subjects were unwisely sent adrift. In the reign of Philip IV. the Catalans rebelled, the Portuguese, who had been united with the Spaniards in the reign of Philip II., threw off the Spanish yoke, and the independence of the Netherlands had to be acknowledged. The decline of Spain from this time was rapid; the rust had already commenced to corrode her power.

The death of Charles II. without issue, in 1701, gave rise to the war of the Spanish Succession, which was continued for twelve years. Charles had bequeathed the crown to Philip of Anjou, the second son of the dauphin of France and great-grandson of Louis XIV.; but this arrangement was disputed by Leopold, Emperor of Austria, who, as grandson of Philip III., claimed the crown on behalf of his son Charles. England and Holland supported the claim of Leopold, being averse to the further aggrandisement of France; and the wars of the Allies, conducted under the lead of Marlborough and Eugene, were successful alike in Italy, Germany, and France. But, as the people of Spain refused to accept Charles for their king, the cause of Philip of Anjou was eventually gained.

The wars of the French Revolution did not disturb Spain much, Charles IV. having early made peace with France on his troops being defeated. But the Spanish nation hated the French, and this gave rise to quarrels between Charles and his son Ferdinand, who took the popular side. Napoleon I., becoming cognisant of these dissensions, undertook to mediate between father and son,

and, getting them both in his power, put them in confinement, while he sent troops to occupy Spain, which caused a general rising of the nation against him. Bonaparte made his brother Joseph king of the country; but his authority was nowhere acknowledged except in the presence of the French armies. For some time the Spaniards fought well, but they were subsequently vanquished and overthrown, whereupon the English stepped forward to reanimate them. The British army, which had operated successfully in Portugal, marched thence to Spain; and, Wellington being placed at the head of the allied forces, the French were repeatedly defeated, and compelled to evacuate the peninsula. Spain thus owed her deliverance entirely to the vigour of the English arms; but in Spanish history it has been deliberately recorded that the Spaniards drove out the French, and were assisted by the English!

Ferdinand VII. was restored to the throne after the victories of Wellington, and re-established the government on a despotic footing, reviving the Inquisition, and dismissing the Cortes. From the earliest times the government of Spain was a mixed monarchy; and a popular assembly called the Cortes, which was composed of the nobles and deputies from the cities, controlled the king. But Charles V. (I. of Spain) and his successors, aspiring to absolute power, removed this check upon their authority, and Ferdinand followed the same course. He was succeeded by his daughter Isabella II., a minor, whose reign was much disturbed by the pretensions of Don Carlos, a nephew of Ferdinand, who contended that Isabella's claim was barred by *salique* law. Against him was formed the Quadruple Alliance, whereby England, France, Spain, and Portugal bound themselves to secure

the throne of Spain to the daughter of Ferdinand and her line, to the exclusion of Don Carlos and his heirs, and the throne of Portugal to the female line of the house of Braganza, to the exclusion of Don Miguel and his heirs ; the result of which was the overthrow of Don Carlos in Spain. The subsequent bad conduct of Isabella, after she came of age and was married, gave great offence to her people, and obliged her to seek safety by flight into France, upon which the kingdom was first offered to Prince Amadeus of Savoy, and then placed under a republican form of government which was recognised by the Great Powers. The Carlist movement having also revived, the country was for a long time much distracted by civil wars, till a new revolution placed Alphonso XII., the son of Isabella, on the throne. The cause of the Carlist party was mainly upheld by the priests ; but the people, who detest the domination of the clergy, were exceedingly averse to it.

At one time the Spaniards were the greatest people in Europe ; but they have long, very long, descended from that height, and are now about the most ignorant and depraved. The splendour and activity of the reign of Charles I. were well suited to literary exertions, and a number of eminent writers flourished in that and the following reigns, among whom were Calderon, Lope de Vega, and Cervantes ; but the subsequent administrations of the country have not been equally favourable either to letters or to greatness in any shape. The forms of a free government are aped both in Spain and Portugal ; but, in the absence of a real spirit of freedom in the nations, they work only as instruments of arbitrary power. The Cortes of Spain is composed of a senate and congress, both of which are equal in authority, or rather equally destitute of power.

Portugal.

Previous to the eleventh century, Portugal, anciently called Lusitania, formed a part of Spain, and with it passed successively under the domination of the Romans, the Suevi, the Goths, and the Arabs. In 1085, Alphonso VI., King of Castile, captured from the Arabs the ancient city of Toledo, knights from all countries of Christendom participating in the conquest. Particular distinction was won on the occasion by Henry, a young knight of Burgundy, who was rewarded for the service by the hand of a daughter of Alphonso, and the government of all the country lying between the mouths of the Douro and the Tagus. This territory Henry increased still further by conquests from the infidels, which included the city of Porto, or Oporto, after which the entire province was named. Alphonso, the son of Henry, fought with a success greater even than that of his father; and, conquering the large and fertile province of Alentejo, was by his victorious army saluted "king" on the field of battle, from which time Portugal became a distinct kingdom, which Alphonso consolidated by wise institutions and laws.

The descendants of Alphonso I. reigned in uninterrupted succession till the time of Alphonso III., who was compelled by Alphonso X. of Castile to attend him in his wars with fifty lances. This mark of dependence was afterwards dropped in the reign of Dionysius the Wise, when the country was further aggrandised. It was aggrandised still more under Pedro I., an able, just, and vigorous ruler, who nevertheless obtained a bad name for contending against the powers of the Church, which he greatly

reduced. His successor, Ferdinand, left an only daughter married to John, King of Castile, who claimed the succession on behalf of his wife. Most of the grandees of the country favoured his claim; but the people were more mindful of national liberty, and elected in preference John, a natural son of Pedro, who, defeating the Castilian army, reigned for forty-eight years, justifying the choice of his subjects by rendering that period the most brilliant that Portugal had yet known. It was in his reign that the Portuguese crossed the Straits of Gibraltar and conquered Ceuta from the Moors. More glorious still, the great voyages of discovery were now commenced, principally under the direction of the king's son, Henry, who was much attached to the study of navigation and geography. Madeira and the Azores were in consequence occupied and added to the Portuguese dominions, and the coast of Africa was explored.

Alphonso V. conquered Tangiers from the Moors. In the reign of John II. settlements were made on the Gold Coast of Africa, and the Cape of Good Hope was discovered and doubled by Diaz. Then followed the golden but guilty period of Emanuel, when Vasco de Gama proceeded to the East Indies, and, after him, Alphonso Albuquerque, by whom the native States were forced to acknowledge the supremacy of Portugal, which brought little advantage to them, while it saddled them with the thralldom of a bigoted intolerance that proceeded so far as to establish the Inquisition at Goá. The places landed at, and where settlements were formed, were: Ormus, Goá, Calicut, Cochin, Canará, Malábár, Malaccá, and Macáo; and for more than half a century these possessions were maintained vigorously, which promoted commerce, but at the cost of an oppression and rapacity that no

subsequent adventurers from the West ever ventured to emulate.

The Inquisition was introduced into Portugal and her dependencies during the reign of John III., which was in other respects as illustrious as that of his father Emanuel. This was the commencement of Portugal's decline. The Jesuits educated Sebastian, the grandson of John, who remained obedient to them after he came to the throne, whereby the priestly and regal authorities were made to combine for the oppression and degradation of the people. At the suggestion of the Jesuits, Sebastian undertook a crusade against the Moors in Africa, and, being defeated by them, disappeared, being supposed by some to have been buried under the slain, and by others to have escaped into the wilderness. His uncle, Cardinal Henry, succeeded him, but, dying shortly after, the succession was claimed and usurped by Philip II. of Spain, a son of Isabella, the eldest daughter of Emanuel.

This arrangement was most unfortunate for Portugal, as it saddled her with all the enemies of Spain. Her possessions in the East were now wrested from her by the Dutch and the English; the Sháh of Persia resumed his hold of Ormus: and the merchandise of Portugal was waylaid on the high seas and captured. Simultaneously with these disasters, an odious and oppressive government was introduced into Portugal by the King of Spain, accompanied by the usual abuses and severities of foreign domination, among which was the bestowal of all the most important and lucrative offices of the State on Spaniards alone. This continued for sixty years, after which the Portuguese, unable to bear the yoke longer, threw it off in 1640, during the reign of Philip IV. of Spain, electing John, Duke of Braganza, descended from the former royal family of Portugal, as their king.

The independence of Portugal was thus regained; but her power had already considerably declined, and she was never able to reassert it. In 1755, Lisbon, the capital of the country, was nearly destroyed by an earthquake, in which fifty thousand persons are supposed to have perished; but in the greater earthquake of the French Revolution, which followed forty years after, Portugal was not involved. Her respite, however, was terminated as soon as Napoleon I. stepped to the foreground, when the country was occupied by a French army, in the reign of Maria Francesca, an imbecile, upon which the regent, being unable to resist the invaders, sailed off with the whole Court to Rio Janeiro, an important Portuguese settlement in South America. A protective alliance had long subsisted between England and Portugal, which now gave rise to the interference of the English in the affairs of both Portugal and Spain, and led to their being rescued. A British force sent to Portugal compelled the French to fall back into Spain, and the British and Portuguese pursuing them thither contributed chiefly to their expulsion from the entire peninsula. The Portuguese Court did not, however, return to Lisbon till 1821, when John VI. reoccupied the throne of Portugal, leaving his son Pedro on that of Brazil, which became a distinct sovereignty.

On the death of John, Maria, the daughter of the Emperor of Brazil, was, in acknowledgment of his right, proclaimed queen; but Don Miguel, another son of John, who had risen against him during the latter part of his reign and was put down, again came forward, and, dismissing the Cortes, got himself proclaimed absolute king. The cause of Maria was thereupon vigorously taken up by her father, the Emperor of Brazil, who, coming over in person, succeeded in deposing Miguel,

and in restoring his daughter to her throne. For a long period after, however, the peace of Portugal was disturbed by the obstinacy and caprices of the young queen, which soon lost her the affections of her people ; and she was only able to retain the crown by agreeing to a new constitution framed in 1838, in compliance with the popular demand. The present king, Louis I., ascended the throne in 1861.

The government of Portugal is a hereditary monarchy, aided by a Cortes ; but the people are ignorant and bigoted, and the nobility not more enlightened, and they are both equally unfit to appreciate an administration that is really free. Correct and liberal views of policy are entertained by a small section—the educated portion of the middle class, who have, however, no power to enforce any change against the feelings of the multitude. The religion of Portugal is Catholicism. In letters she has made no name ; but she gave birth to Camoens.

Italy.

Of Italy we shall not attempt to say much. The dissolution of the Roman Empire was an event of ancient history, and has been previously noticed. The reconquest of Italy for Justinian was accomplished by Belisarius and Narses, the latter of whom, having defeated the Ostrogoths, governed the country in the name of the emperor, till, becoming disgusted by his treatment of him, he sold the kingdom to the Lombards, in 568. The country was thereupon inundated by the barbarians, who established themselves easily in every part of it except Ravenna and Rome, which continued to be held for the Byzantine

emperor, the former by his exarch, or governor, and the latter by the Bishop of Rome. In the course of time Ravenna was reduced; but Rome, though frequently menaced, still held out, and was once saved by the intervention of Pepin, and again by that of Charlemagne, by whom the kingdom of Lombardy was overturned.

The authority of the pontiffs in Italy dates thus from the days of Pepin, by whom the city and surrounding country were given to the Pope, who, previous to that time, had acted simply as a local bishop, subject to the emperor at Constantinople. The breach between the popes and the emperors began after this to widen; and in 782, Pope Gregory II., being dissatisfied with certain orders of the Emperor Leo regarding the worship of images, threw off his dependence on him, and, founding his power on the choice of the people, arrogated sacerdotal dominion over all Europe, and soon came to be acknowledged as the head of the Church. The virtues of many of the first popes rendered them worthy of the authority thus exercised, and some such authority was certainly necessary at that age for the propagation of the Gospel.

The descendants of Charlemagne were not able to retain their influence in Italy long; and the great vassals of the empire succeeded, therefore, in making themselves virtually independent. Of these the principal were: the Dukes of Benevento, Tuscany, and Spoleto, the Marquises of Ivrea, Susa, and Friuli, and the Princes of Salerno and Capua—besides whom, the catapan of the Eastern emperors governed Apulia and Calabria, his authority being also acknowledged by the republics of Amalfi and Naples, while the Pope ruled over the turbulent people of Rome. The contentions among these for supreme authority were frequent, and, when Berenger II. of

Ivrea nearly succeeded in attaining it, the other competitors invited the aid of Otho the Great of Germany, and the German monarchs thenceforth became the kings of Italy.

In the eleventh century, the Normans invaded Italy and conquered Apulia, Calabria, and the island of Sicily, and the confusion created thereby helped much to augment the pretensions of the popes. The ignominy to which Henry IV. of Germany was obliged to submit has been noticed before; and it has also been stated that his son, Henry V., was obliged to renounce the right of investing bishops with the ring and the crosier, being only allowed to confer temporalities on them by the sceptre. What still kept open the quarrel between the two parties was, that the election of the pope required the emperor's confirmation, and the election of the emperor the consecration of the Vatican—the first having been assumed as an imperial, and the second as a spiritual privilege, both from the time of Charlemagne.

In the twelfth century, several free cities arose in power in Italy and established an independent and republican form of government, the chief of them being Milan, Pavia, Verona, Padua, Pisa, Florence, Genoa, and Venice; and, as these took up warmly the perpetual disputes which were raging between the emperors and the popes, their mutual wars and animosities were incessant. The contest with the emperors was ended at last by the edict of Frankfort denying the right of the pope to interfere in imperial elections; and, in the same vein, the popes, from the time of Gregory VII., never condescended to seek for imperial confirmation. The superiority of the papal over the royal power lay in this, that the arms employed by the Pontiff were excommu-

nication and interdict, the operation of which on the minds of the superstitious was unfailing, to which the temporal arms of the emperors could offer no sufficient resistance.

In the thirteenth century, the republics in Italy were numerous and independent, and several of them rose to great opulence and power. But most of these were soon after reduced under the rule of their *signora*, or tyrants, and began rapidly to decline; while Genoa and Venice, which retained their republican form, continued in their career of industry and greatness, carrying on an extensive and lucrative commerce, which was only diverted from them on the discovery of an easier passage to the East round the Cape of Good Hope.

In the fourteenth century, the Christian world was scandalised by the appearance of three or four rival popes at one and the same time, and their quarrels with each other, which were terminated by the deposal of all the candidates by the Council of Pisa, and the election of a new pope—Martin V.—in 1414. These unseemly disturbances contributed much to lower the influence of the popes; the dissolute lives of the clergy also gave great offence; and the general education of the people contributed at the same time to lessen the fears of excommunications and interdicts: all which circumstances prepared silently the way for the Reformation.

In the sixteenth century, the greater part of Italy became subject to Charles V., as King of Spain, after a protracted quarrel with France, which claimed several portions of it as fiefs of the Holy See, while the claim of Spain was based on inheritance from local sovereigns by female descent. From this period Italy began to languish; the trade of Venice and Genoa fell off, and most of the

cities came to be governed by officers of German and Spanish origin, or by princes connected with the houses of Austria and Bourbon. She had no disturbances now to dread; but her ancient spirit had declined, and she sank fast into luxury, occupied in the enjoyment of her arts and natural advantages.

At the outbreak of the French Revolution the principal divisions of Italy were: the principality of Savoy, the popedom, the republics of Genoa and Venice, the grand-duchy of Tuscany, and the small principalities of Parma and Modena. Naples and Sicily were governed by a king of the Bourbon line, while Mantua, Milan, and other places were in the possession of Austria. The French, under Bonaparte, invaded Italy in 1796, upon which the Austrians, being defeated, were obliged to relinquish their possessions. On a renewal of the war in 1799, the Austrians, assisted by the Russians, were able to recover a great part of what had belonged to them, but were again deprived of them after the battle of Marengo. In 1805, Bonaparte was crowned king of the country, and Joseph and Murat were successively made King of Naples, while the pope, deprived of his temporal sovereignty, was conveyed to Paris.

On the downfall of Napoleon, the Congress of Vienna effected a redivision of the country, by which the papal territories were restored to the pope, and Naples and Sicily to their former king; Piedmont and Genoa, being united, were given to the king of Sardinia as the representative of the Dukes of Savoy; and the rest of Italy, including Venice, was absorbed by Austria. But this arrangement did not satisfy the Italian States: it was no longer suited to the wants and genius of the people, who were all more or less in favour of an independent existence.

Their impatience of a foreign yoke increased daily, and the unconciliating spirit in which Austria resumed her possessions revived the antipathy against her. In 1830, an Italian revolution was planned in Paris, which died out on receiving no support from the government of Louis Philippe; but in Italy itself the efforts of Mazzini continued gradually to strengthen the nucleus of discontent, and, in 1848, Charles Albert commenced the war of liberty and regeneration. He was defeated at Novara; but the people expelled the pope, and declared a republic, which, in its turn, was upset by the French, who re-established the pope, and left a garrison of twenty thousand French troops in Italy for his protection. It was reserved for Napoleon III. to take up the right side of the contest; and on the fields of Magenta and Solferino the dream of a united Italy was realised. The constitution of Italy now is the best in Europe set up on the English model, and is about the closest imitation of it. The executive power of the State belongs exclusively to the sovereign; while the legislative power is vested in the king and parliament, the latter consisting of two chambers—namely, the senate and a chamber of deputies. Unlike other nations of the continent, the people of Italy have really a potential voice in the administration of their country. But the power of the State has not yet been fully consolidated, and much more of fighting may still be necessary to secure that end, for which she is to this moment fully armed.

The name of Italy is dear to every reader of history, not only for the greatness of ancient Rome, but also for the part the country has taken in the revival of letters and arts in Europe. Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, Ariosto, and Tasso, are names that will not easily be for-

gotten. Machiavelli and Guicciardini, as historians; Leonardo da Vinci, Raphael, Titian, and Michael Angelo, as painters; Galileo, as astronomer; and Lorenzo de Medici and Pope Leo X., as munificent patrons of arts and artists, learning and learned men, will likewise long be remembered. But in later times the political condition of Italy has not been equally favourable to intellectual development, and what she is now best known for are her musicians and opera-singers!

Turkey.

Turkey completes the rôle of European States that remained to be named. She is so called after the Turks, formerly a fierce people, though they have become quite emasculated in modern times. The origin of the race was in the centre of Asia, where they worked in the iron-mines of the Altai under the Geugens, or Tártárs, till a bold leader—Bertezená—arose among them, and instructed them to make swords for themselves and achieve their freedom. Proceeding from the Altai, they inundated the countries to the west, and formed their first independent stronghold in the steppés still called Turkestan. The Arabs came in contact with them when, after overthrowing the Persian kingdom, they penetrated the countries of the Oxus and the Jaxartes, for propagating the doctrines of Mahomet; and, finding the Turks to be possessed of as much strength and valour as they themselves were distinguished for, they took large bodies of them into their service, as guards for their kaliphs, by whom many coveted advantages were conferred on them, to attach them more firmly to their interests. The faithfulness of the Turks, however, was but indifferently

secured. The body-guards in time became insolent, while the favourites selected out of them and appointed governors of provinces declared their independence; and when the dynasty of the Abbásides was overthrown, the Turkish power arose upon the ruins of the Saracenic empire.

The Samanian dynasty was the first to succeed the Abbásides, and was, in its turn, displaced by the Seljukian dynasty. When the power of the Seljuks was subverted by the Moguls, the Turks formed several independent principalities of their own, among which was a settlement in Armenia, formed by a leader named Ortogrul. The son of Ortogrul was Othmán, who, on being elected chief of the Oguzian Turks, proceeded in the direction of Phrygia, and, taking Brusa from the Greek Empire, laid the foundation of the Ottoman power. He accepted the Mahomedan religion, and, proclaiming that he had a divine mission to propagate it, excited the fanaticism and valour of his troops, and obtained from them a blind and implicit obedience. He was thus able to subdue a large portion of Lesser Asia, and consolidated his conquests by great bounty and liberality to his men of war and to the poor; and his son Orchán, following in his footsteps, added considerably to his territories, besides forming a strong force, known as the *Janizaris* (*Ján-nissárás*, or "Life Guards"), which did good service in his day, although it subsequently became very famous for revolts.

Amurath, the successor of Orchán, was first obliged to put down a combination of the Mahomedan princes of Asia against him; after which he turned his arms against Europe, and, having passed over to Gallipoli with a powerful army, seized upon several important places in

Thrace, terminating a series of victories by the reduction of Adrianople, to which the seat of his government was removed. The rapid decline of the Greek Empire at this time subjected it to successive losses of territory, till the imperial power came to be confined to the city of Constantinople and a part of Thrace and Bulgaria. But Amurath met with considerable opposition from a formidable confederacy of the Slav tribes, which made a resolute stand against the common enemy; and it was only after a terrible conflict that this opposition was overthrown.

A fierce and remorseless warrior, Bajázet, who well merited the surname of *Ilderim*, or the "Lightning," assumed by him, succeeded Amurath, and defeated a Christian army of sixty thousand men reinforced by the noblest chivalry of Germany and France, and commanded by one of the greatest generals of the age—Sigismund, king of Hungary. But his Asiatic dominions being shortly after invaded by Timour-lung, the Mogul, at the head of eight hundred thousand men, Bajázet was defeated in his turn, and subjected to a cruel and humiliating bondage which he did not long survive; and this interrupted the progress of the Ottoman power in Europe for the time, giving a respite to the Greek Empire, which continued to hold on for half a century longer.

For ten years after the death of Bajázet, the Ottoman Empire was distracted by the pretensions of rival competitors for the throne, till it was assumed by Mahomed I., the youngest son of Bajázet, who consolidated his father's conquests, and successfully established his authority both in Europe and Asia, for which he was proclaimed to be the second founder of the empire. Amurath II., his son, inherited all the valour of his race; and, the Greek

emperor having set up a pretender to the throne, he proceeded against him, subdued a large portion of the Byzantine territory, and defeated the Hungarians in a great battle at Varna. His successor, Mahomed II., pursuing the same course, besieged and captured Constantinople, which filled all Europe with consternation; and ever since that city has remained the capital of the Ottoman Empire.

Bajázet II. was killed by his son Sélím I. The history of Turkey is so full of horrors of this nature that we cannot stop to notice them. As a ruler Selim signalised himself by adding Syria and Egypt to the empire, whereby he also derived from the last of the kaliphs the influence and authority which they had exercised over the followers of the Prophet. His son, Solymán the Magnificent, repeatedly defeated the Hungarians and the Germans, acquiring several important places from them. He also took Rhodes from the Knights of St. John, and otherwise obtained possession of most of the islands in the Mediterranean, of the towns of Tunis and Bisertá in Africa, and of Bagdád. The island of Cyprus was reduced by his son Selim II., with whom accession of territory was closed. The fleet of Selim was destroyed at Lepanto by the combined fleets of Venice and Spain; and the princes who succeeded him were not able to repair the loss, being only known to fame for their murders and debaucheries within the hárem, and for an imbecility which made the Janizaris insubordinate, and led to perpetual rebellions.

Under Mahomed IV. the power of Turkey became again for a moment formidable to Europe, chiefly from the abilities of his vizier Achmet Kiuprili, one of the ablest statesmen that Turkey, or Europe, has ever known. He took Candia from the Venetians, and made some conquests also from the Germans, Hungarians, and Poles. But

fortune veered back with his death, and Sobieski, king of Poland, compelled the Turks, in 1683, to raise the siege of Vienna, and, in 1687, they suffered another severe defeat in Hungary, which led to the deposition of Mahomed IV. After this the power of Turkey rapidly declined; and, in 1699, she had to cede Transylvania to Austria, Azof to Russia, and Morea to the Venetians, the last of which was subsequently recovered.

The reign of Achmet III. was the era of the conflict of Charles XII. of Sweden with Peter the Great; and Achmet having given an asylum to the former after his defeat at Pultowa, was drawn into a war with Russia in which Peter was worsted, he being only rescued from danger, as has been related in the preceding chapter, by the treaty of Pruth, which was negotiated by the impromptu diplomacy of his wife. Achmet was less successful in a war with Austria, by which he was compelled to relinquish Belgrade; and, being also defeated by Nádir Sháh in Persia, the Janizaris arose against him and deposed him. In the reigns which followed, the wars between Russia and Turkey were frequently repeated, and the latter was gradually compelled to relinquish all her possessions on the north coast of the Black Sea. Russia also assumed the right to protect the Christian princes of Moldavia and Wallachia; and on the Persian frontier Georgia and Armenia were lost.

There was no renovation for Turkey in subsequent years. In the reign of Selim III. peace with Russia was purchased by great sacrifices of territory, and Egypt was invaded by the French, who had to be expelled from it by the English. In that of Máhmood II. the Greeks fought for their independence, and secured it in 1828, after the destruction of the Ottoman fleet by a combined action on the part of

Britain, France, and Russia. Later, a war with Russia broke out, in which the Turkish armies were uniformly defeated, and large concessions had to be made to prevent the occupation of Constantinople. On the other hand, Máhmood was able to carry out military reforms within the empire, by which the power of the Janizaris was broken; and many other changes were effected which facilitated the acquisition of European civilisation by his people.

The last years of Máhmood II. were disturbed by the defection of Egypt, where the viceroy, Mehemet Ali, aspired to independent sovereignty. The dispute was terminated in the reign of Abdool Mejid, under the terms of a convention signed in London between England, Russia, Prussia, and Austria, by which the hereditary *páshalic* of Egypt was secured to the family of Mehemet Ali in subordination to the Porte. The tranquillity which followed this settlement was soon after disturbed by the desire of Russia to hasten the dissolution of the Turkish Empire, on the pretext that some interference was necessary on behalf of its Christian population. This brought on the war of 1854, from which Turkey came out unscathed, on account of the support given to her by France, England, and Sardinia.

It must be conceded, however, that the sick man is really sick, and so sick as to be almost beyond all reasonable hopes of recovery. The vigour which led to the establishment of the empire has long ceased to exist. All the present strength of Turkey consists in the maintenance of armies and fleets commanded by European officers, but from which no lasting benefit can be derived in the absence of a strong backbone to rest upon. The government of the country is still an absolute despotism, which the influence

of European civilisation has not modified to any considerable extent. Its religion is Mahomedanism according to the Sooni doctrines, and is yet bigotedly adhered to; and the fundamental laws of the empire are based on the Korán. Some reforms have certainly been made in the political organisation of the State; but they have given it no vitality. No progress whatever has been made in the country in literature, the sciences, and the arts. The Russian *dictum* is therefore undoubtedly correct, that the existence of Turkey in Europe at this hour is an anomaly which ought to be rectified. The war of 1877 had almost effected this rectification after the manner desired by Russia. The end has been staved off for a time, but it is not the less certain to come.

CHAPTER IX.

THE INDEPENDENT STATES OF ASIA, AFRICA, AND AMERICA.

THE principal States of Asia, Africa, and America, other than those which we have noticed in the preceding chapters, now require to be mentioned.

China.

Commencing with the States in Asia, we first notice China, a country of the ancient world which has prolonged its existence to the present day. The territory appertaining to it is only inferior in geographical extent to that owned by Russia in Asia, while, on the other hand, it is much more productive and more thickly populated. Over a considerable portion of it, however, the supremacy of China is merely nominal, several places in Tartary being virtually independent, as also is Thibet.

The modern history of China commences properly with the conquest of the country by the successors of Chingez Khán, previous to which period it was not much known to the nations of the West, except by doubtful report. In the thirteenth century it was visited by Marco Polo, the Venetian traveller, who repaired to it through Turkestan, and took service under Kublai Khán, the greatest monarch of his day. The first European nation to visit it by sea were the Portuguese, and Xavier sailed for it

with the benevolent intention of converting it to Christianity, but died while off the coast, in 1552. In the commencement of the seventeenth century several Jesuits, Dominicans, Franciscans, and Capuchins entered the country, and at first their success in conversion was not inconsiderable, though the heart of the country was not then, as it is not even now, accessible to foreigners. All the attempts of the British government to open intercourse with China have been made mainly in connection with the opium-trade; and only recently, after much fighting and negotiation, have some twenty-two ports been opened to European traffic, and access given to Peking.

The population of China Proper is estimated at above four hundred millions, and has from time immemorial enjoyed a name for diligence. The cultivation of the earth is particularly prized, but no branch of art or industry is neglected. The consequence is, that China produces everything that she requires for her own use; and it is well known that her manufactures are not much, if at all, inferior to those produced in Europe. In the construction and use of firearms, in printing and engraving, in the manufacture of silk, cotton-cloths, and earthenware, the Chinese have always taken the lead; and in the three last they do not yield the palm of superiority even now to any nation. But, unfortunately, Chinese civilisation is, or rather has hitherto been, stereotyped, and this has operated as a great bar to improvement. Set anything before a Chinese workman, and he will readily produce its exact duplicate, although the tools he uses are few and clumsy as compared with those used by European artificers. There is no reason, therefore, why China should not be able to follow in the wake of the

nations of Europe if she chooses to do so. What China is now best known to European nations for is her tea, which, grown elsewhere, seldom acquires the same flavour and quality.

The condition of the Chinese people is very low, because the despotism which governs them is very rigid. The administration of the country is nominally in the hands of a Privy Council, formed of the different Ministers of State; but the power of the emperor is supreme, superior to that of the Council, and even to the laws. The laws, in fact, pronounce him to be the head of the empire and of the State religion, and invest him at the same time with the sole proprietorship of the soil, which is let out to landholders, and through them underlet to tenants. In former times the government was patriarchal, and the grinding screw was seldom applied, but that phase of the administration has long disappeared, every sort of oppression having since been gradually introduced. The mandarins, imitating the sovereign, are now proportionately tyrannical, and arrogate as much power under him as he arrogates over them; and the example is followed step by step to the lowest grade of officialism. The general religion of the country is Buddhism; but it has been correctly asserted that the worship of the emperor is the real religion of his subjects. All this accounts for the present excessive demoralisation of the people; but there is nevertheless no doubt that China is yet the strongest power in Asia, England and Russia excepted. She has now an army either commanded or guided by European officers, and armed with European arms, and a navy of iron-clad gunboats, intended primarily for coast defence; has conquered the Panthays, or Mussulman insurgents on the south-west; is planning

the conquest of Yárkand as a revolted province; and every now and then threatens a demonstration in the direction of Nepál, and is not unanxious to measure swords with Cashmere. In the arts of peace her superiority is still more marked and decisive. Her entire extent is traversed by imperial roads, and by a network of canals, by which a vast internal trade is carried on; and, having anticipated Europe in many of the most important inventions, the progress she made she has retained. Her conservatism, also, has since commenced to die out, for railways and telegraph lines are being constructed and opened out; and this promises a yet further advance for her in the future.

Japan.

The next State to notice is the island-empire of Japan, or Zipangu, supposed by some authorities to be an offshoot of China, and by others of Tartary, which was first brought to the notice of Europe by Marco Polo. The annals of the country fix the foundation of its monarchy at some seven hundred years before the Christian era. The government is hereditary and theocratical, the emperor, or *Mikado*, being both king and high-priest. The offices were separated in the sixteenth century, in the reign of Taiko Sama, who took to himself the title of *Koboe*, or lay emperor; and, for a long time after, Japan continued to have two emperors at one and the same time—namely, the Mikado, or ecclesiastical emperor, and the Shogun, or secular emperor—the power of the second being subordinate to that of the first. In general acceptance the Shogun was regarded as the Mikado's lieutenant, though actually he often exercised paramount authority,

as most of the Mikados passed their lives in idleness and seclusion, with concubines and flatterers. More recently the second post has been abolished, and the Mikado has at the same time thrown aside his seclusion and indifference.

The Portuguese opened European intercourse with Japan by visiting it in 1542, and Xavier went to it eight years after. In 1600, a Dutch vessel was wrecked on the coast of one of the islands, on board of which was an Englishman named Adams, the first of his nation who landed in that country. He rose into great favour with the emperor, and invited first the Dutch and afterwards the English merchants to visit it. But the prospects of the Christians there were shortly after spoilt by the Portuguese, by an attempt they made, in concert with the Japanese Christians, to overturn the native empire and establish a Christian dynasty. An atrocious massacre of all Christians was the punishment meted out for the crime, and this was followed by a proclamation that no followers of that faith were thenceforth to be allowed to land in Japan, which the Dutch evaded by boldly asserting that they were Dutchmen and not Christians, which in that age was very near the truth.

In 1811, the English took forcible possession of Java, Sumatra, and the other Dutch possessions in the East; but it was not till many years after that any attempt was made to reopen communication with Japan. An opportunity to do this was afforded in 1831, when a junk was blown off the coast into the Pacific Ocean, and, after drifting for a long time, was cast ashore in America at the mouth of the Columbia river, where the crew were taken care of by some Englishmen and Americans. To carry these people back to their country was the pretext

on which an attempt to renew intercourse was made ; but the advances were repulsed, and the vessel, refused admittance into Japanese waters, was obliged to fall back to Macáo. The persistence of the English and the Americans in their endeavours to secure a friendly intercourse with the country were, however, eventually successful ; and, since 1854, amicable treaties have been entered into under which, as in the case of China, four Japanese ports and the town of Yeddo, now named Tokio, have been made accessible to the treaty-powers. Free intercourse between foreigners and the natives has not even now been attained ; but it is expected that shortly it will be.

The Japanese are decidedly the most forward nation in Asia, being more in advance than the Chinese. Their whole country has been revolutionised since the opening of communication with foreigners, whom they now imitate almost in everything. The government is, of course, still an absolute despotism, but one in which the despot is subject to a system of unchanging laws, besides which he has of late imposed many restrictions on himself in imitation of European States. He has, like the emperor of China, his Council and Secretaries to assist him in giving effect to the laws ; and for the government of the country at large he has vassal-princes under him, each over a specified jurisdiction, with his minister and secretary to assist him. The people, as is the case all over the East, have no rights or privileges, but they are full of new aspirations and ideas, which must in time fructify to their advantage. All classes are also very industrious, and for a long time there has been a fair share of civilisation and refinement even among the poorest. From the highest to the lowest every Japanese is sent to school ; and it is said

that there are more schools in the empire now than in any other country in the world, and that they have all been recently reorganised on the European model. The condition of women, which some consider to be the best test of civilisation, is also better in Japan than in any other Asiatic country.

Burmáh.

Of the independent States between India and China, the principal are *Burmáh* and *Siam*. The old history of *Burmáh* is full of civil dissensions between the Burmese and the Peguans, which were very sanguinary. In 1750-52, the latter, with the assistance of the Portuguese, captured *Ává*, and annexed *Burmáh* to Pegu. But this triumph was short-lived. The royal family of *Burmáh* being unable to maintain the contest, it was warmly taken up by an adventurer—*Alompraw*—who, having defeated the Peguans, assumed the throne. He also took summary vengeance on the English and the French, who had established factories in *Burmáh*, and always interfered in her civil feuds with a view to secure their own ends; and this ill-faith of the foreigners was long remembered against them in the country, in which they were refused a footing.

In 1767, *Burmáh* was invaded by a Chinese army of fifty thousand men; but the reigning king, *Shempuan*, was vigorous, and gave it such reception that not a man of the whole force ever returned to China. In 1794, a Burmese army of five thousand men crossed the British frontier, and entered the district of *Chittagong* in pursuit of some refugees from *Arracan*, but retreated on being told to do so, when the delinquents were given up. This

opened an intercourse between the English and the Burmese, which often became irritating on account of the constant flight of refugees from an ill-governed country, till at last war broke out between the two governments, in 1824. The ostensible grounds of the war were disturbances in Cáchár, the throne of which was contested—one claimant being upheld by the English, and the other by the king of Burmáh. The Burmese fought well, at least the English generals said so—a common clap-trap on the part of victors to secure greater praise to themselves. The war was terminated by the acquisition of Arracan by the British government, the Burmese being at the same time expelled from Assam and Cáchár. This was the origin of British Burmáh, which is now governed by a British Chief-Commissioner.

The government of Burmáh is despotic ; but less so in the eastern districts than in the neighbourhood of Mandalay ; and, in the north-east, it is so overlapped by the power of China, that it is often difficult to say where the one ceases and the other begins. Even in the proximity of the capital the despotism, though oppressive, is not unlimited, being subject to the influence of the priests. No king dares to treat the sacerdotal class with disrespect, as that would promptly lead to the subversion of his throne. The rest of the people are of no account : but Mrs. Judson describes them as being lively, industrious, and energetic, and more advanced in civilisation than other eastern nations generally. The religion of the country is Buddhism ; and of course Caste, the great bugbear of India, is unknown. The country having now been fairly laid open, there is every chance of its gradual improvement, as it is not an old and effete State, nor too proud to learn.

Siam.

Like Burmáh, Siam also was at the outset constantly involved in wars with Pegu. In the seventeenth century, it had the misfortune to have a Christian—a Venetian nobleman named Phalcon—for prime-minister, who concerted with the French the conversion of the king and the establishment of a Gallic-Indian empire in the East. But the Siamese nobles discovered the plot and defeated it, the minister being killed and the French expelled the country; and, as the king had been partial to his minister, the royal dynasty was changed. In 1821, steps were taken by the British government to open a friendly intercourse with Siam; but the special mission despatched for that purpose was unsuccessful. Greater success was obtained on the acquisition of British Burmáh, when the British and Siamese frontiers came to coalesce; and the intercourse thus opened has been so well cultivated that the present king of Siam visited Calcuttá when Lord Mayo was at the head of the administration. The government of the country is despotic, but more liberal than that of Burmáh, a great share of political authority being vested in a number of hereditary chieftains, who are owners of the land. The king has besides a deputy, who is called the second king, and also a State Council and a Privy Council, a government gazette, and an official newspaper for the publication of articles on arts, sciences, and literature. The institutions of Europe are now being largely imitated in all parts of the world, but unfortunately without being really appreciated.

Persia.

Passing over India, which we have already noticed, we

come to Persia, the modern history of which commences with its conquest by the Arabian Kaliphs, in 641, when all that was useful, grand, or sacred in the country was destroyed. A great portion of the conquered inhabitants in submitting to their new masters adopted the religion propagated by them, as affording the only means of securing equal rights with their conquerors; while the rest, self-banished, preserved their religion and manners in foreign lands. These latter are the Pársees, the largest number of whom are located in the Bombáy Presidency, in India. Their country was held by the kaliphs for more than two centuries, the history of which period is represented mainly by petty revolts. Its possession was afterwards usurped by a leader of banditti—Yacoob-Ben-Leis, and then by the families of Samáni and Dilemi, between whom the royal power was divided.. These were succeeded by the Seljuks, of whom the greatest was Alp Árselan, the victor of Romanus Diogenes, the husband of the Empress Eudoxia. The tomb of Alp Árselan is at Merv, and bears the following motto: "O ye, who have seen the glory of Alp Árselan exalted to the heavens, repair to Merv and behold it buried in the dust!" The glory thus vaunted of was confined to military conquests only.

In the thirteenth century, Persia was conquered by Haláku, a grandson of Chingez Khán, who captured and demolished Bagdád, and put to death the last kaliph of the house of Abbás. It was during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries that the most celebrated authors of Persia flourished; but this was also the period of the greatest distraction in the State, which was only terminated by the conquest of the country by Timour-lung, in 1384. The fourth son of Timour, Sháh Rokh, was a distinguished patron of letters, as also was his son, Ulugh Beg; but the

supremacy of the family was of short continuance. In 1502, one Sháh Ishmail made himself master of Persia, and founded the Suffanean dynasty, the greatest ornament of which was Sháh Abbás, who was severe to his ministers and nobles, and barbarously cruel to his own family, but who promoted commerce, countenanced Christianity, and patronised literature and the arts. In 1722, the Afgháns under Máhmood conquered Persia, but were soon expelled by Nádir—the general of Tamásp, the rightful king—who also defeated the Russians and the Turks. Nádir was himself proclaimed king by the nobles in 1736, and greatly augmented the consequence of Persia by his conquests. But the affairs of the country fell again into confusion upon his being assassinated, and Ahmed Sháh Dóoráni took that opportunity to establish a separate independent kingdom in Kabool. Since then the prestige of Persia has been still further reduced by her wars with Russia, by whom she has been dispossessed of all the provinces between the Black and Caspian Seas.

The distractions of Persia, and its frequent conquests by foreign invaders, have reduced the greatest empire of the ancient world to the extreme of weakness and imbecility. It now lies quite at the mercy of the Russians, who can occupy it at any moment they choose. In all other respects the Persians may be, as they are described to be, the same as they were in the days of Darius and Noshirwán the Just, but their old martial character has become extinct, and fifty thousand Cossacks would now march through the country unopposed, from one extremity of it to the other, provided no European power came forward to interfere. Nádir Sháh defeated the combined armies of Russia and Turkey in 1722; in 1922 it is doubtful if Persia will retain an independent

position. The government of the country is an absolute monarchy ; but there is a certain amount of self-government in the towns and villages, which choose their own judges and magistrates. The people are distinguished from other oriental races by education, a superior civilisation, and grosser morals. But altogether their subjection to Russia would not be a disadvantage either to themselves or to their neighbours.

Arabia.

Arabia is the last of the Asiatic States remaining to be mentioned. Its modern history opens with the advent of Mahomet for the high purpose of bringing the pagan Arabs to a knowledge of God. "The injustice of Meccá, and the choice of Mediná," as Gibbon expresses it, "transformed the citizen into a prince, and the preacher into a leader of armies." The religion he preached was also purer than the Christianity of the age, and thus came to be rapidly and extensively propagated ; and, as every country that accepted it accepted also the sovereignty of the kaliphs, the Arabian empire under the last of the Ommiyades extended from the confines of Tartary and India on one side to the shores of the Atlantic on the other.

This extent of territory, however, led to the consequence of Arabia itself being much impaired. On the general massacre of the Ommiyades, the thrones of Egypt, Western Africa, and Spain became independent ; while the seat of government of the remainder being established at Bagdád, Arabia was reduced to the rank of a province of the empire. In 1258, the metropolis of Islámism fell into the hands of Halúku, the grandson of

Chingez ; and, the last of the kaliphs being murdered by him, Arabia reverted to its former state of anarchy and confusion, being subdivided once more into a number of petty principalities ruled over by their respective Sheiks and Emirs.

In the eighteenth century an attempt to reunite the nations was made by a new prophet named Abdool Wáhab, who appeared in the province of Najd, and proclaimed his mission to be to correct the abuses which had crept into the Mahomedan religion, particularly in respect to the worship of saints and the use of spirituous liquors. His doctrines were widely propagated among the tribes of the East—so much so that the British government in the centre of India had to watch over the Wáhabeen movement that disturbed its repose. In Arabia itself, however, many of the Sheiks refused to accept the innovations offered, which were also rejected by the holy cities of Meccá and Mediná ; and, though they yet remain very powerful, universal dominion over all Arabia, which they aspired to, was never acquired by the Wáhabees. The general sovereignty over Arabia is now claimed by the Páshá of Egypt on behalf of the Sultán of Turkey : but there are several chiefs scattered over the peninsula who are entirely independent ; and the Bedouins remain unsubdued and unchangeable, hostile towards everybody crossing their path, and only momentarily amenable to authority when strongly backed by arms. These have never been civilised, and probably never will be. They live in tents, and move about from place to place, each family owning only a few sheep, goats, and horses, wherewith to support themselves. For the most part they live by plunder, and yet are they all highly contemplative, and religiously inclined. Of Arabia

generally it may be correctly said, that, towards the end of the nineteenth century, it is in as barbarous a condition as any portion of the world; notwithstanding that the Saracens, or Moors, in their days of greatness, contributed so much to the civilisation of Europe.

The African States.

Very little can be said of the States of Africa, because very little is known of them. The chief divisions of the country are: (1) Moorish Africa, or the coast-land of the north; (2) Sahara, or the sandy desert; (3) the Nile districts, including Egypt, Nubia, and Abyssinia; (4) Negroland, East; (5) Negroland, West; (6) the Upper Western Coast; (7) the Lower Western Coast; (8) Southern Africa, including the Cape Colony; (9) the Eastern Coast, including Mozambique, Zanzibar, the island of Madagascar, etc.; and (10) the unexplored regions between the lower western coast and the eastern coast. Of these, the first and third divisions only have been fairly examined: the former as being nearest to Europe, to which it seeks to be attached; the latter as the theatre of the vigorous researches which have been prosecuted of late throughout the entire region of the Nile. As to the rest, very small portions of them only have yet been opened out, and it will probably take an immense long time to develop even these tracts fully.

In a general way, the continent may be divided into two main divisions—namely, the portions north and south of the Kong Mountains and the *Jebal al Komar*, which give rise to the Senegal and the Niger, and were long believed to give rise also to the Nile. All the countries

to the north of this line are still ruled and partially occupied by foreign races of Arab descent, who took possession of them in remote times, driving the aboriginal population to the mountains and deserts in the interior. The countries to the south of the line are entirely peopled by the negro race, the extreme south only having been partially colonised by the English and the Dutch. The tribes scattered over such a vast extent of territory are of course very dissimilar to each other in their peculiarities. The habits of all of them are equally simple, but their characters vary between the extremes of mildness and ferocity, and they are so isolated from each other that they rarely come together except to fight. Towards the eastern coast the Negro features change for those of the Caffré race, and towards the south for those of the Bechuana and Hottentot races.

The west coast, which is Negroland throughout, was the first to come into European notice, the Portuguese having established themselves in it in connection with their earliest maritime discoveries. The success of Diaz in doubling the Cape subsequently diverted the energies of his countrymen to another sphere, upon which the work of African exploration was taken up by the English. But all the good thus done to Africa had reference only to the advance of geographical knowledge. No attempts were made by either the Portuguese or the English to civilise the inhabitants. Of course converts to Christianity were made, which testifies only to the irrepressibleness of the missionary character. Many of the races which have been converted eat their dead mothers to this day !

In connection with recent events, the Gold Coast, Ashantee, and Zanzibar have come into prominence ; but

there is nothing especial about them as distinguished from other places. There is no doubt that Africa has a future; but, with England struggling at one extremity and France at another, it will be very slow work to develop her fully if the other European powers do not take part in the work. Why does not Germany, which has so much redundant energy to spare, seek an outlet for it near the equator, and annex the Negroland?

Mexico.

The States in America requiring to be noticed are: the more important of the republics which sprang into existence on the dissolution of the Spanish monarchy, and the empire of Brazil which had so long belonged to the Portuguese. The Spanish dominions in America at one time surpassed in extent the territorial possessions of Great Britain and Russia. They consisted of Mexico, Guatemala, Porto Rico, and Cuba, in North America; and New Granada, Peru, Buenos Ayres, Caraccas, and Chili, in South America. Of these, Mexico conquered by Cortez, Peru by Pizarro, and Chili by Almagro, were the most important. The first invader on the field was Cortez, who landed in America in 1519, with five hundred and eight soldiers and one hundred and nine seamen and artificers. The natives, instead of opposing their entrance into the country, facilitated it in every way, till they got alarmed by the discharge of their firearms, after which all attempts to get an interview with Montezuma, their king, were discouraged.

The first settlement established by Cortez was at Vera Cruz. He increased his power by an alliance with the chief of a disaffected Mexican town, and prevented the

defection of his own followers by the voluntary destruction of his little fleet, by which all hopes of retreat were cut off. A forced interview with the king, and his violent seizure and retention as a prisoner, made Cortez the ruler of the empire in Montezuma's name, till an attempt to overthrow the religion of the Mexicans roused them to revolt. The struggles that followed do not require to be noticed in detail. The Spaniards were strengthened by the addition of a hostile armament sent against Cortez from Cuba, which was first defeated and then bought over; and Montezuma dying a prisoner, and his second successor, Guatimozin, being put to death, all Mexico submitted to the victor, and was annexed to Castile. The achievements of Cortez were, however, not successful in securing the confidence and favour of his sovereign. A new viceroy was appointed to supplant him in Mexico; and, on his return to Spain, the only consolation left to him was the immense fortune he had amassed, which he was permitted to retain.

The vastness of the enterprise undertaken by Cortez, and the boldness by which it was carried out, palliated to some extent the lawlessness of his proceedings, and the atrocities by which they were accompanied. After him the colonial history of Mexico has nothing particular to interest the general reader. From 1535 to 1808 Mexico continued to be governed by viceroys sent out from Spain, and the whole country was easily converted to Catholicism. The government was very dissimilar in character to that adopted in the English colonies when they sprang up. The Spanish possessions were not colonies, but distinct kingdoms held in fief by the Crown under a grant from the Pope. The people who went to settle in them took out few or no women from Europe,

but formed connections with the wives and daughters of those they conquered. A large Creole population was thus gradually formed, which soon rose into importance. In 1810, the invasion of Spain by Napoleon I. caused a revolution in Mexico, the natives of which fought stoutly for liberation. The insurrection was headed by Spaniards, while the Creoles were equally divided on both sides. The royalists proved successful on the occasion, and treated the patriots who were defeated with great severity. People who are constantly speaking of the Black-Hole of Calcuttá and the atrocities of Soorájá Dowláh, should read the accounts of the dungeons of San Juan de Ullua, where the sentinels on duty frequently fainted from the horrid effluvia issuing from them.

A second revolutionary movement broke out in 1821, and was concluded successfully in 1824. A republican form of government was now established quite independent of Spain, and every inhabitant of Mexico—Spaniard, Creole, or American—was declared to have equal rights. This declaration of independence excited much admiration at the time; but the result has not justified the expectations that were raised. The political organisation of the country has been mainly, and with but few modifications, copied from that of the United States. But the experiment has not been equally successful. Nations require to be educated to freedom before it can safely be assumed by them; and the Mexicans have not yet proved themselves to be worthy of their independence. Their irregularities gave rise to several disagreements with European States, and in the time of Napoleon III. an endeavour was made to force on them a sovereign selected by France. The United States objected to the interference, and the French being worsted, their nominee

was captured and murdered. Since that time there has been nothing but anarchy and misrule in the country, to which have been superadded the general misery arising from an arrested state of agriculture and commerce. A large portion of the country has already been absorbed by the United States, and sooner or later the whole may come to the same end. All the well-wishers of Mexico wish that this fate for her may soon be realised.

Peru.

Peru, the country of the Incas, was first visited by the Spaniards in 1526, when Huanca Capac, the twelfth Inca, was on the throne. The government of the Incas was a theocracy, the sovereign uniting in his person the supreme temporal and spiritual power. The people were pacific and their superstition mild, in which respect they materially differed from the Mexicans, whose superstition was ferocious. They were moreover industrious, and particularly addicted to agriculture, which they carried on with greater skill than any other nation in America. They also possessed a knowledge of various arts, such as founding metals, etc., which was peculiar to them.

The fame of the gold of Peru brought down the Spaniards to it from beyond the isthmus of Panama, the first to reach it being Pizarro, a soldier of fortune, who was struck by the barbaric opulence and civilisation of the empire. He returned to Spain to obtain the royal authority to conquer it, and brought out with him three vessels carrying one hundred and eighty soldiers. He arrived at an opportune moment, when the country was involved in a civil war, and assuming the guise of an ambassador, was joyfully received by the Inca, Atahualpa,

who solicited his assistance in putting down the revolt. The seizure of the king and the massacre of his troops was the established policy of Spanish faithlessness in those days, and secured the possession of the kingdom to the king of Spain

In 1535, a general insurrection of the Peruvians took place under Manco Capac, the Peruvian heir to the throne; but this was put down. The Spaniards subsequently divided into parties and fought against each other till all the desperate characters among them were killed, which was followed by the firm establishment in the country of the royal power of Spain. The colonial system of administration adopted by that power was everywhere outrageously oppressive. It was particularly felt as such in Peru, on account of the compulsory labour imposed on the people for working the mines. Every Indian from the age of eighteen to fifty was forced to labour in the mines, and for this purpose had to quit his family, relinquish his trade or occupation, and proceed to a distance of many hundred miles; and of these many thousands perished, both from removal to a different climate and from a sudden change of habits. The rapacity of the governors was also great, and was only equalled by the rapacity of the priests.

Goaded to insurrection by so much tyranny, an attempt to free themselves was made by the Peruvians in 1780; but this proved unsuccessful, mainly because, instead of making common cause with the Spanish Americans, the Peruvians fought indiscriminately against them and the government. The Spanish Americans were more successful when they rose against the government on the invasion of Spain by Napoleon I. Peru was the last of the Spanish possessions in America to take

part in the insurrection, but was not the least successful. Its independence was finally accomplished in 1824. The constitution of this country also is modelled after that of the United States, the legislative power being vested in a Senate composed of deputies from the provinces, and in a House of Representatives. The people are free from direct taxation, the public revenue being mainly derived from the sale of guano; but misrule and revolutionary disturbances have prevented their amelioration in all other respects.

The Smaller Spanish Republics.

The smaller Spanish republics do not require to be separately named. In their main features they resemble each other, the possession of liberty and free institutions by them being merely nominal, while the chief controlling power is a military despotism. The only exception to this rule is perhaps Chili, which is better governed than the rest, and has been blessed with internal peace for a number of years; but the mass of the people do not understand true liberty much at any place.

Brazil.

The only Portuguese possession of importance in South America was Brazil, which was first discovered by Pinzon, a Spaniard, but was afterwards taken possession of by Cabral, the Portuguese navigator, in 1500. At first the intercourse with the natives was very friendly, but this good understanding did not continue long. The attachment of the natives was misused, upon which they repaid ill-treatment so atrociously as led, in a short time, to an

end of voluntary emigration from Portugal. It was now that Brazil began to be utilised by the Portuguese government as a penal settlement, and the convicts sent out committed barbarities which were scarcely surpassed by those of the Spaniards in Mexico and Peru. Beyond sending the convicts, however, the Portuguese government did nothing in the country for many years, during which period some French merchants effected certain settlements on the sea-coast, while the Spaniards established themselves on the banks of the Paraguay. These advances of other nations at last alarmed the Court of Portugal, and led to Brazil being divided into a number of hereditary captaincies, which were bestowed on distinguished grandees, who began to people the country at their own expense, exercising regal rights—each within his own holding. The subsequent misuse of power by the grandees rendered it necessary to appoint a governor-general over them, and the first officer of this rank was sent out in 1549.

The first colony established by the Portuguese was St. Salvador, in Bahia. The greatest service was done to it by the Jesuits, who mixed freely with the natives, conciliated their confidence and attachment, and extended the confines of the settlement. In 1578, Brazil, in common with Portugal, came under the dominion of Spain, on Sebastian of Portugal being cut off by the Moors, and remained under subjection for about sixty years. Spain being at this time at enmity with the whole world, Brazil suffered considerably from the hostility of the English, the French, and the Dutch, the last of whom succeeded in establishing in it a settlement of their own.

In 1640, Portugal shook off the Spanish yoke, and, finding that the Dutch were engaged in a sanguinary

conflict with the English for the sovereignty of the seas, she took further advantage of the opportunity to recover her lost ground in Brazil, for which she afterwards paid the Dutch in hard cash, on the whole of Brazil being ceded to her by treaty. After this there were wars again with France and Spain; but these were relieved by the brilliant discoveries made in Brazil, first of extensive gold-fields, and afterwards of the diamond-mines for which the country has since become famous. In 1710, the French made a last effort to take Rio de Janeiro, but were defeated by the Portuguese, after which peace was concluded between the two nations.

In 1807, the French invaded Portugal with the design of seizing the royal family, upon which the whole Court, with everything that could be transported, left Portugal for Brazil. The need of Brazil to Portugal was now demonstrated; it was also established that Brazil had no longer any need of Portugal. The French invasion of Portugal thus virtually gave birth to a new empire in a new hemisphere. Brazil now became a kingdom, and began to develop herself; and, when the Court returned to the mother-country in 1821, Brazil insisted on her liberty, offering her throne to the prince-royal of Portugal, which, after some vain efforts to reunite the two countries, was accepted. At this moment, next to the United States and Canada, Brazil is the best governed and most progressive State in America. Its constitution is based on that of the North American Union, but departs from it considerably by following that of Portugal in several respects. The internal resources of the country are inexhaustible, and the government has undertaken their development with con-

siderable earnestness. But the physical disabilities of the territory are great, as rocks and swamps intervene between the maritime provinces and the interior; and a very rapid improvement in its condition is therefore not be anticipated.

CHAPTER X.

RÉSUMÉ.

IN the preceding pages we have gone into greater details than we intended, but we do not regret having done so, since those details best explain themselves. We have noted all the turning-points of modern history, and explained how the destinies of the several races were shaped; and both the resemblances among and the diversities between them have been fully accounted for. The periods which most require general attention are those relating to—

1. The emigration of nations from Asia into Europe, and the gradual distribution of the Germanic tribes over all the countries of the West.

2. The restoration of the Western Empire by Charlemagne, and the development of the Saracens in Spain.

3. The consolidation of all kingdoms by the establishment of Feudalism.

4. The Crusades, and the institution of Chivalry.

5. The Tartar conquest of Russia, and the Turkish conquest of the Eastern Empire.

6. The struggles for popular freedom, and the foundation of municipal towns and cities.

7. The Reformation of Religion, and the reorganisation of empires and governments.

8. The discoveries of Columbus and Gama, and the

colonising and commercial enterprises they gave birth to.

9. The struggles for freedom, commencing with the war of American independence.

10. The French Revolution, and the convulsions caused by Napoleon I.

11. The unifications of Italy and Germany.

12. The new order of things that has succeeded the most recent disturbances.

The theatre of the Ancient World was Asia, and only towards the end of the epoch did the empires of Greece and Rome arise. The theatre of the Modern World, has been Europe wholly, the other continents and places in them being noticeable merely for such connection as they may have established with Europe. The new era begins with the emigration of nations from Asia, when the figures of Greece and Rome disappear, making way for peoples hitherto unknown and undreamt of, that roll over each other like ocean billows, sweeping away the Roman power before them, but only when that power had become too corrupt to endure. The old world, found wanting after prolonged trial, is forced to fall back, and give place to newer races permitted to prove their worth. The first of these were the Goths, who are supposed to have been of non-Asiatic origin, though settled for a time in the north of Asia. They returned to Europe in the fourth century, bringing after them many nations, of whom the Huns were the most prominent. The empire of Rome was now overturned, which enabled the bishop of Rome to assume a great amount of temporal power and dignity, both of which were conceded to him from an idea that there must be a supreme authority somewhere, and from the absence of any other aspirant for such authority.

The other kingdoms of Europe were simultaneously occupied and repopled, after which the wave of inundation subsided. A faint effort to revive the empire of Rome was made in the reign of Justinian, by Belisarius and Narses, but the internal decay of the empire was too great for any such effort to succeed. The barbarians established themselves forcibly in every place, first, in all the Western countries, and, afterwards, also in the East; and the French, becoming the central power, were also the first to accept Christianity. The Anglo-Saxons in Britain received Christianity after them, but became sooner distinguished alike for their intellectual and religious culture; and they sent over Christian teachers to Germany and Switzerland, by whom both general knowledge and religion were propagated. This gave to all the countries of Western Europe a nearly uniform constitution, and opened one channel of communication between peoples that had already become dissimilar.

The first great king was Charlemagne, by whom the Western Empire was re-established. Previous to this the Moors, or Saracens, had founded themselves in Spain, and had made violent efforts to conquer France, from which, however, they were heroically repelled. The empire of Charlemagne was great, but that of the Moors was in all respects greater. The first days of Mahomedanism were barbarous, and it is recorded of Omar that he burnt the Alexandrian library; but in the days of Almánsoor and Haroun-al-Rashid, the latter of whom was contemporaneous with Charlemagne, the Moors were the best educated and most refined people in the world. They had a fair share of civilisation, all the institutions of social life, all the arts of industry; but the barbarians of Europe had none. The Franks in particular were not only bar-

barous, but grossly immoral; the other Gothic nations were perhaps not equally depraved, and the Scandinavian branch of the race was probably decidedly better, but these had not yet developed themselves. The best model that Charlemagne had to follow to civilise his people was that presented by the Moors, which was far nobler than the model held out by the Greeks; and thus France and Europe came to borrow all their civilisation from Asia. Algebra and the numerals, chemistry, medicine, and geography, were all learnt from the Moors, and with them all the conveniences, and many of the refinements, of civilised life.

At the same time that Charlemagne contended with barbarism on the continent, Alfred was doing the same good service in England. Both these sovereigns founded schools and promoted the study of the sciences; and the latter also gave his subjects an independent constitution. But the age they lived in was that of iron, and their fostering care died with them. The empire of Charlemagne was very soon broken up, and with it was lost much of the civilisation he had planted. In England, the Normans, for the time at least, uprooted all that Alfred had taken so much pains to cultivate. The world's history was thus thrown back for three hundred years.

The first era of modern history was that of the peoples. All the conquests effected by the barbarians were popular undertakings, the chiefs who directed them having scarcely higher privileges than their followers. The later movements of the Normans and the Danes partook of the same character, and so also did the establishment of the Magyars on the east of Germany. Nay, even the disruption of Charlemagne's empire was effected at the choice of the people, who demanded and selected a separate king

for Germany. But, after this period, we lose sight of the multitude altogether, and read only of kings and nobles, —a change entirely brought on by the introduction of feudalism, which, as an organised plan of defence, arose spontaneously among the several races on their being settled in their new territories. The warriors who had best assisted their leaders in establishing their power, obtained, by grant, or by the force of their own arms, the possession of large tracts of land, on condition of continuing the service they had rendered so well, the concession being made from the consciousness of a necessity for defending the possessions which had been acquired against the inroads of fresh aggressors. In the disorders that followed, these chiefs, so selected, asserted a lawless authority, which their kings, or superior leaders, were not able to control, and the weak, being anxious for protection, secured it by placing themselves in the same relation to the lords nearest to them as that in which they had originally stood to the paramount sovereign, holding their lands from them on terms of feudal service. The whole system was entirely defensive: it created a strong militia of landholders, great and small, to supply the place of a standing army. But it was disruptive of the former organisation of the community in this way, that, on the one side, it cut down the authority of the sovereign power to a nominal supremacy, and, on the other, reduced the authority of the people, by making them thoroughly dependent. In Germany especially, throughout the feudal times, the power of the sovereign was confined to the privilege of calling the nobles together for purposes of peace or war; and in France the state of things was no better—the kingdom being reduced, as Hallam describes, to a mere bundle of fiefs, and the king to little

more than one of the feudal nobles, differing rather in dignity than in power from the rest. The system, nevertheless, had its use; for without it the kingdoms established would never have been sufficiently defended. There were no garrison-towns in those days, nor regular armies; and some arrangement of the kind was absolutely necessary to secure protection against dangers both from without and within. It made amends particularly for the absence of police, the battlements of the baron providing safety not only to himself, but to all those who crowded round him for defence. In France and Germany it led eventually to the formation of principalities and seigniories, the chiefs of which became virtually independent, as they always retained under themselves a number of counts and margraves, or military functionaries with feudal rights, who followed their banners even against the common suzerain, when occasion arose; but in Britain, and the northern kingdoms generally, the system was better regulated, though there also the strong-armed Jarks often acted independently of their kings.

All this time the States of Europe were more or less isolated from each other, never coming in contact except to exchange blows. This isolation was first broken up by the Crusades, which were begun in the eleventh century and concluded in the thirteenth. Like all great movements, they did much to dissolve old bonds and further the cause of improvement. The commercial spirit of all the nations was now, for the first time, called forth; communication with other races diffused education and civilised manners; and the power of the nobility being reduced by the expenses which were entailed on them, the cause of popular liberty began to look up;

while Chivalry, which was contemporaneous with the movement, contributed its quota of assistance in clearing the atmosphere. Some think that Chivalry was begotten of the knights; but they were so barbarous and fierce at the age when it arose, that the more correct supposition apparently is that it was foisted into their code by the clergy, who only were in advance of the times. The nobility of the age comprised the strength of the nation, and the clergy its intelligence; and, as the latter were called forth into existence mainly for the purpose of counteracting the influence of the former, they took great pains to mitigate the condition of the people and develop their energies, by which means they knew they would be best able to hold the nobility in check. As instituted at first, Chivalry was only a defence against club-law, which was then all-prevalent. The rights of the poor were arbitrarily overridden, and innocence and weakness had no safety; the magnitude of distress no compassion. But the clergy saw that the barons, so strong-armed, were excessively weak-brained, and this enabled them to lay down rules, the acceptance of which could not but change the spirit of the times. The bait took; and the effects of the institution were soon found to be very salutary, and have now outlasted its existence. Many of the refinements of modern society, much of the *finesse* in honour, friendship, and love, much of the endearing traits of humanity and generosity, are the remnants of a system which was introduced at the right moment, and loyally aided in ameliorating the popular condition.

The last country in the order of civilisation was Russia, though under the house of Rurik she did not appear to disadvantage as compared with other places. Her subsequent conversion into a Mogul province, which position

she retained for two centuries and a half, undid the little good that was done to her by the Varangians; nor was much done for her afterwards till the time of Peter the Great, in comparatively modern times. The Turkish conquests in the south were nearly contemporaneous with the Tártár conquest of Russia. The ascendancy of the Crescent had given occasion to the Crusades and the disorders which were thereby committed in Lesser Asia. These were retaliated upon Europe by the Turks, who destroyed the Eastern Empire after it had survived the Western Empire by a thousand years, bombarding Constantinople with guns, the use of which was then little known in Europe. The whole of the eastern side of Europe was thus in trouble for a later period than the other portions of it; but the conquests of the Turks in particular were not without their advantages. The destruction of the Greek Empire greatly weakened the power of the popes; and the convents with their rich libraries being opened to the world, contributed much to the revival of letters, which, in their turn, called forth aspirations for enlightenment and liberty.

The struggles were hard which emancipated the people. The reign of slavery lasted in Germany till the beginning of the thirteenth century, in France till the middle of the fourteenth century, and in England and Italy till the beginning of the fifteenth century. But in Germany, the duration, though shortest, was more gloomy than in any other country; and it was there that the secret tribunals, originally formed for the purpose of distributing justice and protecting innocence, contributed so greatly to strengthen the rule of barbarism. The wish for human rights had, however, been already created, and could not now be kept down, for the courage to assert it

had also appeared. Alongside of the feudal castles, villages had arisen to minister to the wants of the barons who extended their protection to them. These villages in time had become towns and cities; the extension of commerce had gradually made them rich and powerful; and when the nobles, fearing them, tried to stamp them out, they rose against them, and destroyed the reign of caste. These independent towns were most numerous in Italy, Germany, and France; there were some also in England. They introduced laws, liberty, and a republican form of government amongst themselves, and soon made considerable progress in literature, the sciences, and the arts. But their ascendancy was not the less based on a series of tumults, disorders, and high-handed acts of oppression, without which it could perhaps never have been effectually secured.

A large number of petty republics could best fight the large number of feudal barons scattered all over every country; and the system of republican towns was accordingly continued so long as it was needed. But this period was not very long. The wealth of the barons had already been reduced, and with it their power also; the discovery of gunpowder had narrowed the difference between them and the other orders; and an ecclesiastical class had arisen which, originally as tyrannical to the people as the barons themselves, had veered round to assist the former in achieving their freedom. The continuance of municipal administration ceased therefore in time to be necessary; and, left to themselves, the towns and cities began to fall out with each other, and were easily broken up. But the people had already tasted liberty—the thin end of the wedge had been securely inserted—and the problem began gradually to be worked

out in all countries by which the power of the barons was overturned. The power of the sovereigns was in the same ratio increased; and the wars between France and England having broken out, led, among many mischievous results, to the one good result of combining all parties in both countries, which paved the way to the establishment of great monarchies.

The great monarchies appear at the same time with the Reformation, which was as much a political as a religious movement. Throughout the Middle Ages all power and learning were monopolised by the clergy, both from choice and from circumstances, for the other classes of Europe were then in no condition to appreciate either. This facilitated the dominion of priestcraft; the popes early took advantage of the times; a hierarchy was established in every country; and the pontifical power was gradually extended, till it attained its zenith in the thirteenth century, when the empire of old Rome was fully revived, though in a different way in the papacy. Of the great increase in the power of the barons we have already spoken, and, where the barons were not absolute, the power of the kings was offensively arbitrary. A great convulsion, a general purging was therefore needed by all Christendom; and this was effected by the Reformation, which reformed, not religion only, but polity also. It elevated the national mind everywhere. The darkness which succeeded the first age of Charlemagne and Alfred was only partially removed during the reigns of Frederick II. of Germany, and Alphonso X. of Castile. The full blaze of light was not restored till the days of Wicliffe, Huss, and Luther, when everything had to be done *de novo* for improving the popular mind, since books, schools, and knowledge had all intermediately disappeared. The

power of the Church over the State was now broken down ; and what was materially of great advantage to the people was that the Church lands were restored to the laity.

The consolidation of monarchies was effected during the era of Charles V., Francis I., and Henry VIII. The dissensions between Protestantism and Catholicism broke out at the same time, and, continuing for a long period, disturbed the States greatly. This was fomented by the popes through the Jesuits, who had recently started into existence, and also by means of the Inquisition, which filled the world with terror. But the age which witnessed these disturbances also witnessed events of a salutary character, the era of geographical discoveries—of the explorations of Columbus and Gama, which turned over a new page of history—having immediately preceded it. The discovery of America opened out an immense field for independent growth, and made the people in all countries more self-reliant. A new world was pointed out to every one who felt his energies cramped at home ; and millions and millions of oppressed subjects, or those who thought themselves to be oppressed, found exercise for their expanded hopes and aspirations in the young country beyond the wide ocean. Commerce, really so called, was now originated ; and Spain and Portugal, as pioneers in the way of discoveries, also became, each successively, the first great commercial nation of Europe. But this position they were not able to retain long, mainly on account of their brigandism and tyranny ; and the defection of the Netherlands led to the course of traffic being diverted. The Dutch, emulating the Spaniards and the Portuguese, soon supplanted them ; and their neighbours, the English and the French, following the

example, the masters of Mexico and Brazil were beaten in the race.

With the discovery of new worlds came also the discovery of the Copernican system, on which all modern science is based, and the discovery of printing, which has contributed so much to set the world free. The class of citizens and burgesses began now to develop themselves fully in every State; and a very healthful rivalry was kept up for some time, from which Europe was recalled in the seventeenth century by the aspiring ambition of Louis XIV., who disturbed everything, and paved the way for the convulsions that came after him. France already ruled Europe by her language and refinement; she had also taken a high stand in the culture of the mind. But what her vain and excitable people yet wanted was glory and grandeur by arms. This will-o'-wisp she pursued through many a marsh and many a fen, but only to founder deeper in the mire; and eventually the loss to her prestige was as great as the substantial loss she sustained in comfort and possessions. Britain came out of the struggle with flying colours, but only to get foundered in her turn. The expenses of the struggle made her unjust to her colonies, which resisted her attempt to impose arbitrary taxes. This was the first great fight for independence. The cause of the United States was so good that volunteer warriors from all countries swelled the ranks of the Republican army. Not only Frenchmen, Germans, and Poles, but even Englishmen joined them as recruits. England in the war stood by herself alone; those not in arms against her kept aloof in armed neutrality, looking at her with lowering eyes; her hands were full of other affairs also—namely, of wars in India with the Mahrattás and

Hyder Ali. The cause of independence was thus easily gained.

It was now that the eyes of France were opened to her own condition. "America, a distant colony of a rival nation, fought for and won her independence, while we," exclaimed the French, "are in our own country no better than slaves." They viewed with alarm the deficit caused in their finances by the wars of Louis XIV., and, refusing to sanction the imposition of fresh burdens, caused the States-General to be summoned, which had not met for one hundred and seventy-four years; and, when it did meet, while the aristocracy and the Church still fought for their ancient feudal rights, the people solely demanded immunity from taxation, and the abolition of all prerogatives and privileges. The people were now the great power in the State, and, on decision on their demand being delayed, they took the law into their own hands, raising the well-known cry of "Liberty, equality, and fraternity." Their first call was for reform, and the first scenes of the drama were confined to the declaration of rights, the abolition of prerogatives and privileges, and the repression of abuses, old and new. It would have been a great blessing to the world if they could have stopped there. Then would not France have been still so backward in the race; then would all Europe have benefited by the example, and achieved her freedom. But the glory of the movement terminated at this stage. The wild and inflamed populace did not understand rights; the men who led them hounded them on for blood. The noblest movement of the modern world was thus closed in gloom.

The convulsions inaugurated by Napoleon I. represented only the rebound of the national character from real

aspirations to the old pursuit after fire-flies in the mire. Their own country drenched in blood, the French eagerly sought again for war with their neighbours; and, what with the wars of the Republic and the wars of the Empire, all Europe was kept in commotion till 1815. It was the same story again as before, repeated through all its chapters of glory, greatness, defeat, and shame. On one side it was a war of aggrandisement, on the other a war for the preservation of an equilibrium of power—shadows both, but which in all ages have been hotly contended for. No real equilibrium of power exists; the scale is constantly vacillating. Now it is France, now Russia, now Prussia that becomes—for the time only—the ruling military power of Europe. All others take alarm at once, and there is no rest, no cessation of fear, till a good depletion on all sides brings on a forced harmony. The millennium is yet far in the rear—even the millennium of an equilibrium which will leave present arrangements intact has not yet been found. People fancied that it followed the days of Waterloo, till they were awakened from their dreams by the booming of guns in Italy and Germany.

The unifications of Italy and Germany are recent events, fresh in the recollection of our readers. If Napoleon III. did any good act throughout the whole course of his imperial career, that act was the assistance he rendered to Italy in carrying out the scheme of Cavour. France might well have rested content with the glory of the achievement. Every page of history records her frantic struggles for fame and success, which she was seldom able to secure. She won both on the fields of Magenta and Solferino; but, with a meanness for which the emperor alone was personally responsible, the assistance

of France was *sold*. The work of the Italian patriots has, however, not yet been completed. If fresh convulsions in Germany, which are daily becoming more imminent, give Austria the opportunity to do so, she may yet fight, and fight harder than before, for the recovery of her lost possessions in Italy, unless the entire consolidation of that country intermediately should shut out all hopes of success. The present aspect of Europe gives no assurance on the subject on either side.

As for the unification of Germany, the Prussians have carried it out with a high hand, and are apparently strong enough to maintain it as vigorously as it has been secured. But Germany cannot remain in her present condition long; the hot-house growth she has attained will not last except with the aid of many attendant changes, and it is more than likely that her next convulsion will break out from within; and, unless the confederated States are really well-attached to each other, their unification may yet disappear as a dream, for all that Bismarck and Moltke have achieved to secure it. The peace which reigns in Europe now is hollow to the core; and Europe knows it, for she is armed to the teeth. We disbelieve in the numbers given of ancient armies—namely, such as were led by Semiramis, Sesostris, and others; but are we not trying our best to bring back the old state of things, as usually reported, and to rival them in our day? Germany has a total army of 1,800,000 men, and is not yet satisfied with her preparations; the army of Russia, taking the forces in Europe and Asia together, is yet stronger, amounting to about 2,400,000 men; that of Austria amounts to about 1,000,000; that of France to about 850,000; that of Italy is nearly equal to that of France; while even that of England amounts to about

300,000—being larger almost in every case than can possibly be necessary, except to keep up the play that is expected and feared. The strength of France only has been temporarily curtailed, but is in a state of reorganisation: and, as the law of the country enacts universal liability to arms, it can at any moment be very largely increased. Each country is therefore provided with the amplest means of resistance in case of need; and what this may eventually lead to it is impossible to foretell. Every man armed with the bayonet is necessarily a loss to the plough or the workshop; and the plough and the workshop cannot be neglected long for the bayonet with impunity. The complaints of the working classes in Germany are loud already, and are at the same time felt to be just, for the great industries are being ruined, and commerce has long ceased to thrive. Thousands of people are condemned to idleness, and look upon the government with distrust; and the enemies of the empire are agitating on all sides. Of what use will be her 1,800,000 well-trained soldiers when her working classes—those very soldiers in fact—rise up to demand peace, free institutions, and bread?

The five great powers in the age of the Reformation were France, Spain, Portugal, England, and Austria; the five great powers of the present day are England, France, Prussia or Germany, Austria, and Russia; so that Spain and Portugal only have gone out to make room for Prussia and Russia, which have since developed themselves. Of these England alone holds her position in consideration of her moral greatness, the richness of her dependencies, her commerce, and her constitution, and doubtless also as the first naval power in the world; while all the other great powers owe their position, more or less, to their

military organisation, France owing it also to her refinement, and the influence of her manners and language on Europe. The resources of all these powers are very great; but only those of France and England have been fairly developed. The others have been too busy in drilling their soldiers; and the workman withdrawn from his industry, of course, does not work. England, the smallest State in Europe, enjoys a first-class position with the smallest number of soldiers, with reference both to aggregate strength and to percentage on population. But this is not her only claim to pre-eminence. In common with France she leads the van in civilisation; while, in common with America, she spreads it out farthest in every direction. The commercial spirit of the English and the Americans carry them to every part of the globe; and they carry civilisation with them, although it be accompanied by the brandy-bottle. England makes no impression in Europe with her army, for her 300,000 men in Europe, and her 200,000 men in India, are but poor figures against those the great autocrats play with. But beyond their large armies the autocrats have nothing to show, while England exhibits her unbounded wealth, her swarming masses of industrious workmen, her limitless marine. In all these respects America follows in the wake of England closely. The people of both countries are contented and happy, because always at work; the working classes in both are more or less in easy circumstances.

In Europe the example of England has not been much followed. It is not that the other countries do not want to be like her, but that they are unwilling to abandon their own peculiar ways. The wish to be like her is manifested by the general imitation of her constitution; but the form

only has been imitated, not the spirit of it, and the consequence is that, while Alfred's wish that the English people should be as free as their thoughts has been fully realised, no other people in Europe has yet approached them in that respect. Religious and mental liberty have vindicated themselves almost equally in most of the European countries ; the arts and the sciences have been improved and inventions multiplied in Germany and Italy as much as in England and France ; the refinements of private life have also been augmented in all places, though not to the same extent ; and, in most of them, the condition of the humbler classes has been much though not equally improved : but the position of the English people, who seek for no social regeneration, and among whom the word "revolution" has long been forgotten, has nowhere been attained.

We have confined our remarks mainly to the States of Europe, because Europe, with the United States and the dependencies of Great Britain, virtually constitute the modern world. The States of Asia are old and effete ; those of Africa are as barbarous as can well be conceived ; and those of America, excluding the United States and Canada, too unsettled for the formation of any decisive opinion in respect to them. Apart from Europe, the amount of ignorance, barbarism, and misery in all places is still very great, notwithstanding the general boast of the civilisation of the nineteenth century. In most of the other places no civilisation has yet penetrated, while in some of them the civilisation they had has worn out. The progress in material things has latterly been rather remarkable in all places which are not absolutely new. Even China and Japan have accepted physical improvements as represented by iron-clads and arms of precision, and are con-

structing railways, and laying down telegraph-cables to join them with their dependencies. But the spheres of social, intellectual, and political improvement have not been equally, or even proportionately, expanded. The progress in literature is usually held to be marvellous, and the influence exercised by it has generally been exercised in the well-being of mankind. But the area within which there has been any progress to speak of is, after all, very limited : for the portion of the world that reads and writes is still less than the portion that does not read and write ; and the effete States of the East, which do read and write, refuse to accept the mental culture of the West, without which even the closest imitation of her physical improvements will not rescue them from their social and political degradation. The same remark applies also to the sciences and the arts, which, born in Asia, have been preserved in and have spread over Europe, where they have received a new impetus, improving both in standard and taste ; but to a large portion of the world they are at this moment not sufficiently known either to aid in the preservation of life, or to secure its comforts and conveniences.

This is a sad picture of the world we live in. It is doubtful if all the barbarous races in it are capable of being civilised ; but there is no question that a great many of them are, as our experience in North and South America, in Australasia, and in several of the Pacific islands, has already established. An attempt on a wholesale scale ought now to be made to civilise them all ; and this should find better occupation for Germany, Austria, and France than what engages them at this moment. The first action of the nations that migrated from Asia into Europe was destruction, everything everywhere being by them overturned and levelled with the ground. The first action of

the conquerors and colonisers of modern times, including the Spaniards, Portuguese, English, French, and Americans, has similarly been to destroy, not institutions only, but even the aboriginal races they came in contact with. A better policy has since been recognised, though we cannot say that it has yet been generally acted upon. The descendants of the Vikings, who distinguished themselves by conquests, but did not exterminate the races they conquered, now admit the principle that it is better to let the barbarians live, and to buy them over by teaching them the arts of peace, though some still doubt whether it be possible in every instance to do so. The world, it is admitted, is wide enough to hold all the nations in it, including both those who are free and fortunate, and those who are yet held in the bonds either of barbarism or slavery; but it is contended that it has been found by practical experience that the contiguous residence of civilised and barbarous races is often impossible, and necessarily leads to oppression and extermination. If it really be so, it behoves the civilised world all the more to regenerate those who are uncivilised, even with a little violence to commence with; and this can only be fully accomplished, not by missionary exertions, but by secular arms. Charlemagne civilised the Saxons by the sword; let the descendants of Charlemagne now civilise the benighted inhabitants of Asia, Africa, and America in the same way, should there really be no better course to follow. Up to this time what has civilisation achieved worth boasting of? Great were the expectations that wars would die out, and that nations would live side by side in love and peace. That delusion has long been dissipated; Christianity has failed to establish the dominion of love and peace which it has been preaching so continuously and ardently; wars not only

continue, but are day by day being rendered more and more scientific, destructive, and universal. Reading the history of the world carefully, it seems doubtful whether any real advance beyond mere change has ever been made. It certainly does seem that we are only turning with an ever-turning circle, which presents to us different, but not necessarily progressive, phases as it goes round. Assyrian and Persian greatness, and Grecian and Roman greatness, have made way for English and French greatness, which in their turn will probably yield to American and Russian, and Canadian and Australasian greatness ; but the character of the greatness in different ages does not appear to have really much varied. Why does war still define greatness ; why is the most martial nation yet held to be the first ? Actually it is not so. Europe, the smallest part of the world, governs the rest, though even now the most martial races of mankind are to be found in Asia ; and England, the smallest part of Europe, is in reality the first power in the world, though possibly vastness may have its day in the future, as represented by America and Russia, which are now contending for the post of honour, and by Canada and Australasia, which will claim it in due course. Why, then, should military prowess be still held in general estimation to be the one and only criterion of national pre-eminence ? It is this great mistake that is prolonging the era of barbarism. If a life of perpetual tumult be as necessary to States as to individuals, is there no means of securing it except through feuds and fears ? Roll up the stone of Sisyphus by all means as often as it rolls down, if it be the unavoidable condition of our existence to do so. But let us vary the exertion intelligently, by accepting operations still more arduous and far more glorious than fighting with and de-

stroying each other, either for the Rhine frontier, or for the possession of Constantinople.

The regeneration of Asia has been undertaken by Russia. England, satisfied with India, is unable to achieve more, and any attempt on her part to thwart Russia must therefore be simply abortive ; for Providence looks not to the greatness of either Russia or England, but to the well-being of the world. England has, for herself, chosen the colonisation of Australasia and Canada, a glorious undertaking, which promises her the greatest honour and success. The boast of France has been that the French language is the language of Europe ; the boast of England soon will be that the English language is the language of the world. The United States of America have also chosen a splendid field for themselves in their own part of the globe, to which they are trying to do their duty well, though they have most unnecessarily depopulated it of its aboriginal races. Could not the other great empires of the world—Germany, Austria, and France—and the smaller States of Europe, take a share in the work of regeneration, by selecting special fields for exertion in Africa and America and other places yet unoccupied by any European power ? Jean Paul Richter used to say that while the French held the sovereignty of the land, and the English the sovereignty of the sea, the Germans had appropriated to themselves the sovereignty of the air. The Teutons have since deprived the Franks, for the time at least, of their land sovereignty ; but have nevertheless not yet come down from their aerial elevation. It is time, however, that they should ; and the advantage of their present position gives them special facilities which ought not to be neglected. One-fourth of the large army of Germany, which keeps all Europe in

tremor, would conquer and then civilise one-half of the African continent. Observe calmly, and it will be seen that the only nations that are doing best are those that have created work for themselves in this way—namely, Russia, America, and England; that the great nations that are not prospering are those fighting for shadows—a fancied unification where there is no real unity, or a convenient boundary-line which it will always require two parties to agree to. Providence has plenty of useful work for all, if people will only take the trouble to find it out for themselves. The fitness of Africa and South America for European colonisation may perhaps be disputed: though it appears to us that, if unfit for colonisation by Englishmen, they are not necessarily unfit for colonisation by the Germans, a cold and sober race, well calculated to hold their ground where the English would give way. But, if it be otherwise, both Africa and America are certainly open to civilisation by conquest in the manner which has been so successfully followed in India and Central Asia; and a worthier object of ambition could not be held up for general competition. “The age of chivalry has gone,” exclaimed Burke, “and that of sophists, economists, and calculators has succeeded, which has extinguished the glory of Europe for ever!” But we do not think so. It is true that the age of commerce, the best friend of man, has to some extent displaced the age of military bravado, which was, and still continues to be, the greatest enemy of the world; but real chivalry has not gone out from us altogether, and is not incompatible with economy and calculation: and this it is yet open to Germany to come forward and establish.

Germany has no colonies of her own at present, and

yet the number of emigrants from the country every year is very great. Emigration, in fact, is the safety-valve of the modern world; without such depletion the mother-country would in a short time be reduced to the greatest affliction from plethora, or excess. How, then, does the case with Germany actually stand? She sends out all her superfluous energy to America, or, in other words, pays tribute to America in men, just as the Spaniards paid tribute to the Moors in maidens. These emigrants catch republican ideas in their new homes, and transmit them duly to their fatherland. The rulers of Germany well know how that is operating at home, how the materials for a revolution are being slowly and gradually collected. This alone should induce Germany to found a colony of her own.

Of course emigration will conflict with the military spirit of the mother-country, but only in the way it has done in England. It will not make the nation less warlike in its real need, though it may make it less pugnacious by rendering the maintenance of a large army too expensive for mere show. On the other hand, it will certainly raise the condition of the middle classes throughout the country; and, in the modern world, those countries only are and will be the greatest in which the middle classes thrive best. The lower classes even in England are not as well off as could be desired; but for this, also, emigration is the best, perhaps the only remedy, as it opens out to those classes the widest sphere of usefulness at a distance from home. The history of the world, as we read it, teaches us that kings nowhere were ever, as a rule, very brilliant specimens of humanity; and the policy followed in Turkey for several centuries of deposing those who were found to be imbecile, appears

to us to have been a very convenient one, which other nations would have done well to imitate. At any rate, a blind admiration of imperialism at this hour of the day cannot but be regarded as a grievous mistake. Nor do we find anywhere that the nobles and the clergy were ever gifted with any extra degree of self-denial. There is no reason, therefore, why the general mass of any community should sacrifice their interests for the good, real or imaginary, of either kaiser or lord. "Each for himself, and God for us all," is the best motto both for individuals and nations; and the people of Germany, acting in accordance with it, should take their concerns into their own hands, as the people of England have done for a long time past, and emulate the policy inaugurated by England and Russia. They should not, however, go out merely as plundering adventurers, as the Spaniards and the Portuguese did. No possessions held on that tenure can last long. The mission must be one of civilisation; actual benefits must be conferred on the barbarian nations that are subdued: and such service in the general interests of mankind will always bring its own reward.

INDEX.

ABOUKIR BAY, battle of, 138.

Achmet Kiuprili, vizier of Turkey, abilities of, 259; conquests of, 259.

Africa, divisions of, 276; connection of the Portuguese with, 277; connection of the English with, 277; Christianity in, 277; suggestion for working out the future of, 278.

African States, the, 276.

Agincourt, battle of, 25.

Agriculture, development of, in England, 37.

Alexander I. of Russia, treaty of Tilsit concluded by, 209; annexation of Finland by, 209; invasion of Russia in the reign of, 210.

Alexander II. of Russia, liberation of serfs by, 217.

Alfred, check given to the Danes in England by, 18; service to England of, 290.

Algiers, acquisition of, by France, 143.

Alsace and Lorraine, resumption of, by Germany, 148, 181.

America, first colonisation of, 85; first colonisation of, by the English, 86, 87; treatment of the primitive inhabitants of, 86; landing of the pilgrim fathers in, 87; character of the early emigrants to, 88; quarrels between England and her colonies in, 89; declaration of the rights and grievances of the colonies in, 89; declaration of independence by thirteen States in, 90; war for independence in, 90; recognition of the independence of, 91; second war of, with England, 93; development of the United States of, 94; civil war in, 97; liberation of slaves in, 98, 99; system of government in, 101; civilisation in, 104; shortcomings of the people of, 105; intellectual develop-

ment of the people of, 107; character of the people of, 108; natural associations of the people of, 109; ill-will of, towards England, 109, 111; actual position of, 110; mission of, as distinguished from that of England, 110; destiny of, 110; bee in the bonnet of, 112; condition of the minor States of, 304.

American independence, the war of, 30, 91, 135, 288, 299.

Amurath I., reduction of Adrianople by, 258.

Amurath II., defeat of the Hungarians by, 259.

Arabia, 274.

Arabia, modern history of, 274; propagation of Mahomedanism and increase in the greatness of, 274; extent of, 274; destruction of the Káliphat and decline of, 275; Wáhabee movement in, 275; present sovereignty over, 275; condition of the people of, 275.

Arabs, Saracens, or Moors, the, empire of, in Spain, 116, 240, 287, 289; civilisation of, 289.

Armies, the European, strength of, 301.

Asia, condition of the States of, 304.

Asiatic nations, necessary fate of, 13. .

Auerstadt, battle of, 140.

Australasia, 74.

Australasia, present divisions of, 76; success of colonisation in, 78; chief wealth of, 78; population of, 79; commercial wealth of, 79; forms of government in, 80; advance in social matters in, 81; relations between the white and aboriginal races in, 81.

Australia, extent and description of, 74; history of the discovery of, 74; first settlements in, 75; emigration of Scotch Presbyterians to, 75; "gold fever" in, and its results, 76.

Austria, formation of the house of, 165; dominance of the house of, in Germany, 168; unsuccessful attempt to dismember the possessions of, 174; separation of, from Germany by the treaty of Presburg, 176; reunion of, with Germany, 176; disaccord of, with Prussia, 177; war of, with Prussia, and separation of, from Germany by the treaty of Prague, 178; insurrections in, 178; concessions to the Hungarians by, 179.

BAJÁZET, defeat of a Christian army by, 258; defeated by Timour-lung, 258.

- Bátou Khán, conquest of Russia by, 194.
- Belgium, union of, with Holland, 236; expulsion of the Dutch from, 237; independence of, 237; present condition of, 237.
- Bill of Rights, the, character of, 28, 34.
- Blenheim, battle of, 29, 132.
- Blois, assassinations of, 127.
- Brazil*, 283.
- Brazil, discovery of, by Pinzon, 283; taken possession of by Cabral, 283; ill-treatment of the natives in, and their retaliation, 283; utilisation of, as a penal settlement, 284; French and Spanish settlements in, 284; divisions of, into hereditary captaincies, 284; appointment of a governor-general for, 284; colony of St. Salvador in, 284; services rendered by the Jesuits in, 284; domination of Spain over, 284; regained by Portugal, 285; discoveries of gold-fields and diamond-mines in, 285; defeat of the French by the Portuguese in, 285; flight of the Portuguese court to, 285; independence of, 285; present condition of, 285.
- Burmáh*, 269.
- Burmáh, annexation of, to Pegu, 269; independence regained, by, 269; ill-faith of the English and French in, 269; unsuccessful invasion of, by the Chinese, 269; intercourse of, with the English, 270; war of, with the English, and its results, 270; government of, 270; religion of, 270.
- CANADA, 66.
- Canada, extent of, 66; provinces comprised in, 67; history of settlement in, 67; conquest of, from the French, 67; attacks of, by the Americans, 69, 70; division of, into two parts, and constitution given to each, 70; rebellion in, 71; improved administration of, 71; relations of, with the United States, 72.
- Canadian Dominion, the, formation of, 71; extent of, 71; original inhabitants of, 71; commercial value of, 72.
- Catherine II. of Russia, ascent to the throne of, 206; immoral life of, 206; abilities of, 207; achievements of, 207; partition of Poland by, 207; death of, 208.
- Celts, the, 8; in Britain, 8, 16, 18; in France, 8, 114, 115; in Spain, 8, 240; in Italy and the Alps, 8; in the Netherlands, 234.
- Charlemagne, subjugation of the Moslems by, 117; subjugation of

- the Saxons by, 117; extent of the empire of, 153; crowned Emperor of the West, 117, 153.
- Charles I., rebellion in England in the reign of, 27; reign of, overthrown, and king beheaded, 28.
- Charles II., elevation of, to the English throne, 28; neglect of the fleet by, 43.
- Charles V. of Germany, reign of, 169; condemnation of the Reformation by, 170; protest of certain princes and cities, and civil war against, 170; concession by, 171; subsequent conduct of, 171; opposition to, and success of the Protestants, 171; abdication of the throne by, 171.
- Charles the Bald, the first king of France, 118. .
- Charles of Burgundy, league of, against France, 124; partition of the dominions of, 169.
- Charles Martel of France, success of, against the Saracens, 116; clerical testimony regarding the fate of the soul of, 117.
- China*, 263.
- China, geographical extent of, 263; modern history of, 263; visit of Marco Polo to, 263; Portuguese visit to, 263; Jesuits, Dominicans, and others in, 264; British intercourse with, 264; opening of the treaty-ports of, 264; population of, 264; civilisation of, 264; government of, 265; religion of, 265; present strength of, 265; arts of peace in, 266.
- Chivalry, institution of, 119, 287, 293; character of, 295.
- Civilisation, distinguishing traits of, in the ancient and modern worlds, 6; different phases of, at the present day, 9, 10; suggestion for the extension of, 305, 309.
- Clovis of France, rule of, 115; division of the sovereign power equally between the sons of, 116.
- Colonisation, the remedy for national growth, 53; facilitated by geographical discoveries and explorations, 288, 297.
- Columbus, discovery of America by, 85, 242, 287, 297.
- Commerce, history of, in England, 40; treaty of, between England and France, 145; facilitated by geographical discoveries and explorations, 288, 297.
- Copernican system, discovery of, 298.
- Cortez, conquest of Mexico by, 242, 278.
- Cressy, battle of, 25.
- Crimean War, the, 49, 146, 210, 262.
- Cromwell, military despotism in England of, 28; exertions of, to improve the fleet, 43.

Crusades, the, age of, 120, 287 ; number of, 120 ; advantages derived from, 120, 292.

Czar, signification of the word, 197.

DANES, the, invasions and conquest of England by, 18 ; present spirit of, 232.

Denmark, formation of a regular government in, 229 ; introduction of Christianity into, 230 ; union of, with Norway, 230 ; amalgamation of, with Sweden, 230 ; German dynasty in, and secession of Sweden from, 230, 232 ; annexation of Sleswig and Holstein to, and their recent separation from, 232 ; destruction of the fleet of, by Nelson, 232 ; forcible separation of Norway from, 232 ; national spirit in, 232 ; present condition of, 232.

Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, 228.

DEPENDENCIES OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE, THE, 53.

Diaz, discovery of the Cape of Good Hope by, 247.

EASTERN EMPIRE, the, Turkish attacks upon and conquest of, 257, 258, 287, 294.

Edward III. of England, wars of, in France, 25, 121 ; naval victories of, 43.

Egbert, formation of one monarchy in England by, 18.

Egypt, establishment of an hereditary *pâshalic* in, 261.

Elizabeth of England, distinguished reign of, 26 ; mercantile adventures and geographical discoveries in the time of, 26 ; wars of, 27 ; establishment of a school of marines by, 43.

Emigration of nations from Asia into Europe, 8, 287, 288.

Empires and governments, reorganisation of, 287, 296, 297.

England, slow and gradual development of, 33 ; constitution of, 33 ; power of the monarchy in, 34 ; liberty enjoyed by the people of, 34 ; law of publicity in, 35 ; constitution of the peerage of, 35 ; position of country-gentlemen in, 36 ; agricultural development of, 37 ; industrial development of, 38 ; history of the commerce of, 40 ; intellectual and moral grandeur of, 41 ; physical strength of, 42 ; formation of the navy of, 43 ; materials for maritime strength in, 45 ; present state of the navy of, 46 ; army of, 47 ; military spirit and resources of, 48 ; notions regarding the decline of, 49 ; disproportionate greatness of, 51 ; general hatred of, 51 ; example of, 303.

English army, the, history of, 47.

English colonies, the, creation of, 54; relation of, to the mother-country, 83; alleged defencelessness of, 84.

English colonisation, extent of, 53; development of, 54, 55.

English navy, the, history of, 43; present state of, 45, 46.

Equilibrium of power, the, real character of, 300.

FEUDALISM, in Britain, 22, 26; in France, 115, 124; in Germany, 155, 159; reasons for the introduction of, 291; consolidation of kingdoms by, 287, 292.

Fontenoy, battle of, 48, 133.

FRANCE, OR THE *GRANDE NATION*, 113.

France, old history of, 114; Roman rule in, 114; settlement of Franks in, 115; aggrandisement of, under Charlemagne, 117; splitting up of, into principalities, 118; Norman invasions of, 118; settlement of the Normans in, 118; birth of chivalry in, 119; enthusiasm for the crusades in, 120; wars of the English in, 121; English prince on the throne of, 122; expulsion of the English from, 122; *Jacquerie*, or mob-rising in, 123; feudal system in, 124; breaking-up of feudalism and organisation of armies in, 125; wars of, with Germany, 126, 127, 132, 139, 140, 142, 147; reign of Henry IV. and establishment of religious toleration in, 128; reign of Louis XIII. and administration of Richelieu in, 129; humiliation of the nobles and people in, 129; reign of Louis XIV. in, 130; wars of the *Fronde* in, 130; persecution of the Protestants in, 130; establishment of absolute despotism in, 130; career of aggression opened by, and final discomfiture of, 132; Augustan age of, 132; territorial losses of, in the Seven Years' War, 133; second Augustan age of, 134; causes of the Great Revolution in, 134; progress of the revolution in, 135; deposition and execution of the king in, 137; other barbarities in, 137; republican wars of, 138; revolution effected by Bonaparte in, 138; wars and conquests of the Consulate, 139; further revolution in, and wars of the Empire, 139; contemplated invasion of England by, 140; invasion of Russia by, 141; defeat of Napoleon at Leipsic, and occupation of Paris by the allies, 142; flight of Napoleon to Elba, and return thence to, 142; overthrow of Napoleon at Waterloo, 142; despatch of Napoleon to St. Helena, 143; revolution restoring the old monarchy in, 143; summary of

the Orleans rule in, 144; dethronement of the king and formation of a republic in, 144; dissolution of the republic in, by Louis Napoleon, 144; establishment of the Second Empire in, 145; wars of the Second Empire and causes thereof, 146; the Franco-German war, defeat of France, and deposition of Napoleon III., 147; present provisional government in, 148; territorial compensation exacted by Germany from, 148, 181; character of the government in, 149; worship of the ideal in, 149; character of the people of, 149.

Francis I. of France, contention of, for the emperorship of Germany, 125; wars of, with Charles V., 126; defeat and capture of, 126; release of, 126; patronage extended by, to literature and the arts, 126; cruelties of, to the Waldenses of Piedmont, 126; general persecution of heretics by, 127.

Franco-German war, the, 147, 179.

Franks in Gaul, 9, 115, 289.

Frederick Barbarossa of Germany, humiliation of, before the Pope, 160, 161; vigorous administration of, 160; knighthood of the gentlemen-volunteers of, 163.

Freedom, popular, struggles for, 287, 294.

French alliance and treaty of commerce with England, 145.

French revolution, the, causes of, 135; first features of, 136; outbreak of, 136; barbarities of, 137; wars of, 137, 175; *résumé*, relative to, 288, 299; other subsequent revolutions, 138, 139, 143, 143.

Fronde, the, wars of, in France, 130.

GAMA, VASCO DE, explorations of, 247, 287, 297.

Geographical discoveries, 26, 242, 287, 297.

George I. of England, seraglio of, 29.

George III. of England, reign of, 29, 32; war of, with France, 29; civil administration of, 32.

George IV. of England, reign of, 33.

GERMANY, 151.

Germany, ancient inhabitants of, 152; establishment of Christianity in, 152; conquest of, by the Frauks, 153; affairs of, interwoven with those of France, 153; relations of, with the Pontificate, 153; separation of, from France, 154; sovereign of, made elective, 154; main divisions of society in, 155; consolidation of, by Henry the Fowler, 156; reign of Otho

the Great in, and election of a pope by him, 156; reign of Henry IV. in, and discords with the pope, 157; internal feuds and excesses in, 159; wars of the Guelphs and Ghibelines, 159, 160; reign of Frederick Barbarossa in, and his behaviour towards the pope, 160; the Hanseatic league in, 162; Teutonic order of knighthood in, 163: *Vehme Gerichte*, or secret tribunals of, 164; succession of Rodolph I. to the throne of, and formation of the house of Austria in, 165; publication of the Pragmatic Sanction by, 166; promulgation of the Golden Bull by, 166; formation of Diets or General Assemblies in, 166; quarrels of, with Switzerland, and their results, 167; dominance of the house of Austria in, 167; establishment of perpetual peace by the Diet in, 169; redivision of, into ten circles, 169; reign of Charles V. in, 169; reformation of religion in, and its condemnation by the Diet of Spire, 170; protest of certain princes and cities, followed by a civil war in, 170; success of the reformers, and abdication of the throne of, by Charles, 171; Thirty Years' War for repression of the Protestants in, 171; Protestantism established in, by the peace of Westphalia, 172; Rhine provinces taken away from, by France, 172; footing obtained by Sweden in, 172; splitting-up of, into parts, and internal feuds, 172; aggressions on, by Louis XIV., 173; development of Prussia in, 174; constitution of, subverted by Napoleon I., and formation of a protected confederation, excluding Austria, 176; formation of a new independent confederation by the Congress of Vienna, 176; disaccord between Prussia and Austria in, 177; dissolution of the confederation and reconstruction of, 178; war of, with France, 179; unification of, 179, 288, 301; present military system of, and its effects, 180, 301, 302; feature of the early history of, 182; relative position of sovereign, aristocracy, and clergy in, 182, 183; progress made in, since the Reformation, 184; present position of, 185, 302; aspirations for liberal institutions in, 185; complaints in, 302; task for, 308.

Germanic tribes, the, distribution of, 9, 152, 287, 289.

Gibraltar, acquisition of, by the English, 44.

Godunof, Boris, of Russia, scheme for reducing the nobles and people, completed by, 199.

Golden Bull, promulgation of, 166.

Golden Horde, the, supremacy of, over Russia, 194; refusal of tribute to, 195, 196; attack on, by Timour, 196; destruction of, 196.

- Goths, the, in Germany and Scandinavia, 9, 229; different subdivisions of, 151; character of, 151.
- Government, different forms of, 11; comparison between the English and American forms of, 101.
- Granson, Murten, and Nancy, battles of, 238.
- GREAT BRITAIN, 15.
- Great Britain, position of, 15; fabulous history of, 16; Celts, the first known inhabitants of, 16; wars with the Romans in, 16; retirement of the Romans from, 17; arrival of the Anglo-Saxons in, 17; Saxon era in the history of, 17, 21; Danish invasions and conquest of, 18; Norman conquest of, 18; character of the Norman rule over, 20, 22; wars of, for the crown of France, 25; civil wars in, 25, 27; Tudor era in the history of, 25; Stuart era in the history of, 27; success of the Great Rebellion in, 27; Revolution of 1688 in, 27; literary eras of, 27, 28, 33; wars of, with Louis XIV. of France, 29; union of England and Scotland, and adoption of the consolidated title of, 29; completion of the civil, religious, and political institutions of, 29; Hanoverian rule in, 29; war of, with the United States, 30; acknowledgment of the independence of the United States by, 30; fresh wars of, with France, 31; French possessions in the East and West Indies taken by, 31; incorporating union of, with Ireland, 32; progressive character of the reigns of George III., George IV., William IV., and Victoria in, 32, 33.
- Great Powers, the, positions of, 302.
- Greece, independence of, 260.
- Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, leader of the Protestant princes of Germany, 171, 230; death of, at Lützen, 171, 231.
- HABEAS CORPUS ACT, the, passing of, 28.
- Hanseatic League, the, history of, 162.
- Hastings, battle of, 20.
- Henry the Fowler, consolidation of Germany by, 156.
- Henry IV. of France, conversion to Catholicism of, 128; establishment of toleration in religion by, 128; wise and vigorous administration of, 128, 129; murder of, 129.
- Henry IV. of Germany, discords of, with the pope, 157; rebellion of the sons of, 158; execrable private life of, 158.
- Heptarchy in England, 18.

Historical periods, 287.

Hohenlinden, battle of, 139.

Holland, union of, with Belgium, 236; separation of, from Belgium, 237; present condition of, 237.

Holland and Belgium, 233.

Hudson-Bay territory, the, history of, 68; transfer of, to Canada, 68; present condition of, 68.

Hungary, rebellions in, 173, 178.

IGNORANCE. general prevalence of, 304.

INDEPENDENT STATES OF ASIA, AFRICA, AND AMERICA, THE, 263.

India, 55.

India, first English factories in, 56; rivalry of the English, Dutch, Portuguese, and French in, 56; quarrels between the English and the French in, 57; collapse of the French power in, 57; extension of the British territories in, 57; wrongful establishment of the British power in, 58; assumption of the management of, by the British Crown, 58; native attempts to overturn British power in, 59; character of the British rule in, 59; Russophobia and the Afghán war, 60; loss of prestige by the English in, and further wars, 61; probable issue of a Russian invasion of, 62, 63; greatness and wealth of the English empire in, 65, 66.

Inquisition, in France, 127; in Holland, 235; in Spain, 242; in Portugal, 248.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS, 5.

Italy, 250.

Italy, reconquest of, 250; sale of, to the Lombards, 250; divided rule in, 250, 251; kingdom of the Lombards in, overturned, 251; formation of the pontificate in, 251; quarrels between the popes and emperors in, 251, 252; internal divisions and contentions in, 251; invasion of, by the Normans, and conquests in, 252; rise of the free cities in, 252; rival popes in, 253; reformation of religion in, 253; decline of, 254; principal divisions of, 254; invasion of, by Bonaparte, 254; Bonaparte crowned king of, 254; redivision of, 254; aspirations for independence in, 254; expulsion of the pope from, 255; re-establishment of the pope in, 255; unification of, 255, 288, 300; constitution of, 255; literary celebrities of, 255; intellectual decline of, 256.

- Ivan I. of Russia, reunion of private appanages by, 195; removal of the seat of government to Moscow by, 195.
- Ivan III. of Russia, destruction of the Golden Horde and liberation of Russia by, 196; wars of, 196; other improvements by, 196.
- Ivan IV. of Russia, the first Czar, 197; establishment of a standing army by, 197; other achievements of, 197; cruelties of, 198; conquest of Siberia in the reign of, 198.
- JANIZARIS, or life-guards, formation of, 257.
- Japan*, 266.
- Japan, foundation of monarchy in, 266; government of, 266; Portuguese intercourse with, 267; Dutch and English merchants invited to, 267; Christian plot for overturning the native empire in, 267; landing of Christians prohibited in, 267; attempts to reopen communication with, 268; opening of the treaty-ports of, 268; civilisation of, 268; government of, 268; education in, 269.
- Jena, battle of, 140.
- KNIGHTHOOD, orders and associations of, 120; duties of, 121; abolition of the orders of, 121; Teutonic order of, 163.
- Knowledge in the ancient and modern worlds, distinguishing traits of, 7.
- LAUPFELT, battle of, 48, 133.
- Leipsic, battle of, 142.
- Liberty, civil and political, as attained by different States, 11; all States not qualified for, 13; British Isles the home of, 15.
- Ligny, battle of, 142.
- Literary celebrities, of Great Britain, 27, 28, 33; of the United States, 107; of France, 132, 134; of Germany, 184; of Sweden, 232; of Spain, 245; of Italy, 255, 256.
- London, convention of, 261.
- Louis XIV. of France, persecution of reformers by, 130; issue of *Lettres de Cachet* by, 130; suppression of political independence by, 131; concessions for popularity by, 131; assumption of the title of *Grande Monarque* by, 132; career of aggression opened by, 132; discomfiture of, 132; authors in the age of, 132; treatment of Fenelon by, 133; treatment of James II. of England by, 133.

Louis XV. of France, authors in the reign of, 134.

Louis XVI. of France, revolution in the reign of, 136; deposition and execution of, 137.

Lützen, battle of, 171, 231.

MAGENTA, battle of, 255.

Magna Charta, character of, 24.

Mahomed II., capture of Constantinople by, 259.

Mahomed IV., defeat of, by Sobieski, king of Poland, 260; deposition of, 260.

Mahomedanism, progress of, in the south-west of Europe, 116; checked by Charles Martel and Charlemagne, 116, 117; in the south-east of Europe, checked by the Austrians and the Poles, 175.

Malplaquet, battle of, 132.

Man with the Iron Mask, story of, 131.

Manufactures, development of, in England, 38.

Maoris in New Zealand, 77.

Maori Members in the House of Representatives in New Zealand, 80.

Marengo, battle of, 139, 208, 254.

Marlborough, victories of, 29, 132, 173, 243.

Mercantile adventures and geographical discoveries, age of, 26, 242, 247, 297.

Mexico, 278.

Mexico, conquest of, by Cortez, 279; conversion of, to Catholicism, 279; government of, 279; formation of a Creole population in, 280; insurrection in, 280; second revolution in, and independence of, 280; republican government in, 280; subsequent history of, 280.

Migration of nations, the, 8; results of, 9.

Minden, battle of, 133.

Minor Colonies, the, 82.

Minor Colonies of Great Britain, the, enumeration of, 82.

MINOR STATES OF EUROPE, THE, 228.

Monarchies, establishment of, 296; consolidation of, 297.

Morgarten, the Marathon of Switzerland, battle of, 167, 238.

Moscow, repulse of Napoleon I. from, 142, 210.

Mount Tabor, battle of, 138.

Municipal towns and cities, foundation of, 287, 295; decline of, 295.

NAPOLEON I., wars of, in Italy, 138; revolution effected by, in France, 138; becomes First Consul, 139; wars of the Consulate, 139; becomes Emperor, 139; wars of the Empire, 139; contemplated invasion of England by, 140; wars of, in Spain and Portugal, 140; civil government of, 141; invasion of Russia by, and retreat therefrom, 141; subsequent wars of, 141; defeat of, at Leipsic, 142; flight of, to Elba, and return thence, 142; defeat of, at Waterloo, 142; abdication of, 143; capture and despatch of, to St. Helena, 143; résumé of the convulsions caused by, 299.

Napoleon III., establishment of the second empire in France by, 145; fixity of administration conferred by, 145; wars of the second empire, and causes thereof, 146; the Franco-German war, defeat of France, and deposition of, 147.

Native races, the, treatment of, in North America, 14, 72, 86, 96, 107; intermixture with, in Mexico and South America, 14, 280; treatment of, in Australasia, 78, 81; treatment of, in Peru, 282; treatment of, in Brazil, 283, 284.

National greatness, mistaken views of, 307.

Næfels, battle of, 239.

Netherlands, the, why so called, 233; early history of, 234; principal cities of, 234; condition of, in the time of Charles V., 234; progress of the Reformation in, 234; Spanish cruelties in, 235; wars of, with Spain, 235; independence of, 235; history of the western provinces of, 236.

Nice and Savoy, annexation of, by France, 146.

Normans, the, conquest of Britain by, 9, 18, 119; not the same nation with the French, 19; rule of, in Britain, 21, 22; invasion of France by, 9, 118; settlement of, in Normandy, 118; invasion of Italy, and conquests by, 252.

Norway, formation of a regular government in, 229; introduction of Christianity into, 230; union of, with Denmark, 230; amalgamation of, with Sweden, 230; German dynasty in, and secession of Sweden from, 230; wrested from Denmark and annexed to Sweden, 231; present condition of, 232.

Novara, battle of, 255.

OLEG, regent in Russia, acquisition of territory by, 188.

Olga, regent in Russia, conversion of, 189.

Othmán, founder of the Ottoman power, 257.

Otho the Great, deposition of Pope John and election of Pope Leo VIII. by, 156.

Oudenarde, battle of, 29, 132.

PAPAL consecration for confirmation of the imperial title, 154; repudiated by the Pragmatic Sanction, 166.

Papal election, right of, claimed by the emperors of Germany, 157.

Parliamentary system of England, 34.

Paul of Russia, reign of, 208; alliance of, with Napoleon I. against England, 208; murder of, 208.

People, the, movements of, 290, 291; development of, 298.

Persia, 271.

Persia, object of Russian advances in Central Asia, 64; conquest of, by the Arabian Kaliphs, 272; flight of the Pársees from, 272; history of the occupation of, by the kaliphs, 272; subsequent history of, 272; conquest of, by Haláku, 272; expulsion of the Afgháns from, 273; defeat of the Russians and Turks by, 273; Nádir Shah king of, 273; further wars of Russia with, 273; decline of, 273; government of, 274.

Peru, 281.

Peru, government of the Incas in, 281; first visit of Pizarro to, 281; acquisition of, by the Spaniards, 282; insurrection of the natives in, 282; establishment of the royal power in, 282; oppressions in, 282; second insurrection of the natives of, 282; rebellion of the Spanish Americans in, and its success, 282; freedom of the people from taxation in, 283.

Peter the Great of Russia, plot against, 202; barbarities of, 202, 203; formation of an army by, 203; formation of a navy by, 203; travels of, 203; undertakings and achievements of, 204; foundation of St. Petersburg and Cronstadt by, 205; death-bed exclamation of, 205; military achievements of, 205; battle of Pultowa gained by, 205; death of, 206; alleged Will of, 219.

Peter III. of Russia, mad order of, threatening the beards of the clergy, 206.

Pizarro, conquest of Peru by, 242, 282.

Pocohontas, poetical tale of, 86.

Poitiers, battle of, 25.

Poland, partition of, 175, 207.

Pontificate, the, establishment of, 153, 251, 288.

Pope Adrian I., support of, by Charlemagne, and Charlemagne made emperor of the West by, 153.

Popes, the, deposition of, by the emperors of Germany, 156, 158; quarrels of the emperors with, 156, 157, 158, 160, 166; advantage of the power of excommunication exercised by, 161.

Portugal, 246.

Portugal, early history of, 246; conquered from the Moors, 246; aggrandisement of, 246; geographical discoveries of, 247; conquests and settlements of, in the East Indies, 247; Inquisition in, 248; usurpation of the crown of, by the king of Spain, 248; disadvantages of the arrangement to, 248; independence regained by, 248; occupation of, by Napoleon I., 249; flight of the Court from, 249; British interference in, 249; expulsion of the French from, 249; return of the Portuguese Court to, 249; subsequent history of, 249.

Pragmatic Sanction, the, publication of, 166.

Prague, treaty of, dissolving the Germanic confederation, 178.

Presburg, treaty of, for subverting the Germanic constitution, 176.

Printing, discovery of, 298.

Progress, course of, 8, 9; all countries not qualified for, 13.

Protestantism and Catholicism, dissensions between, 126, 127, 170, 171, 235, 242, 297.

Prussia, acquired by conquest by the Teutonic knights, 163; secular kingdom of, founded by Albert of Brandenburg, 164, 174; title of king of, obtained by Frederick I., 164, 174; acquisitions of, by the partition of Poland, 175; formation of a large army by Frederick II., king of, 175; disaccord of, with Austria, 177; war of, with Denmark, and then with Austria, 178; dissolution of the confederation and unification of Germany by, 178.

Pultowa, battle of, 205, 231.

Pyramids, battle of the, 138.

QUEBEC, battle of, 133.

RAMILLIES, battle of, 29, 132.

Reformation of religion, 26, 126, 170, 234, 253, 287, 296.

Reformation of religion in Germany, 170; opposed by Charles V. and condemned by the Diet at Spire, 170; fought for by the Lutheran princes aided by Sweden, France, and Denmark, 171; established by the peace of Westphalia, 172.

Reformers, the, persecution of, in France, 126, 130; escape of, from France, 130; hostility to, in Germany, 170; success of, in Germany, 171; persecution of, in the Netherlands, 235.

RÉSUMÉ, 287.

Rheims, story of the vase of, 115.

Rhine frontier, the, definition of, 127; wars for, 128, 139, 146, 147, 148, 181.

Richelieu, vigorous administration of, in France, 129; freedom crushed out by, 129.

Romans, the, in Britain, 16; rule of, in Britain, 20; in France, 114; in Spain, 240.

Rurik, establishment of a grand-principality in Russia by, 188.

RUSSIA, 186.

Russia, India not conquerable by, 62, 225; probable wish of, to subvert Persia and Turkey, 64, 224; extent and character of, 186; republic of Novogorod in, 187; dominion founded by the Varangians in, 188; private appanages in, 190, 192; establishment of Christianity in, 191; dissemination of civilisation in, 191; made European by Vladimir and Yaroslaf, 192; epochs in the history of, 192; progress during the first historical period of, 192; relapse during the second historical period of, 192; princes of note during the second historical period of, 193; subjugation of, by the Tártars in the third historical period of, 194, 287, 293; princes of, not unthroned, 194; reunion of private appanages in, 195; removal of the seat of government of, from Vladimir to Moscow, 195; refusal of tribute to the Golden Horde by, 195; destruction of the Golden Horde and liberation of, 196; complete restoration of, by Ivan IV., 197; formation of a standing army in, 197; annexation of Siberia to, 198; reduction of the nobles and people to slavery in, 199; elevation of the house of Romanoff to the throne of, 200; review of the first four historical periods of, 200; supremacy over the Cossacks of the Ukraine acquired by, 201; revolt in, 201; reign of Peter the Great in, 202; aggrandisement of, 205; reign of Catherine II. in, 206; terri-

torial expansion of, 207; encouragement to letters, arts, and sciences in, 207; gain of, by the partition of Poland, 207; reign of Paul, the mad emperor, in, 208; reign of Alexander I. in, 209; treaty of, with France, for the establishment of a duocracy, 209; annexation of Finland, etc., by, 209; Napoleon's invasion of, and the burning of Moscow, 210; assumption of the protection of Germany by, 210; reign of Nicholas in, 210; war of, with Turkey and her allies, 210; secret proposals by, for the partition of Turkey, 210; present extent and population of, 211; variety of races in, 211; gradual conquests of, 212; consolidation of the conquests of, 212; authority of the emperor in, 212; aristocracy of, 214; government of, 215; position of the people in, 216; advances made by, 218; commerce of, 218; progress of letters and polity in, 219; objects of, as set forth in Peter's will, 220; actual objects of, 220; position of, as civiliser of Asia, 221; civilisation of, 222.

SADOWA, battle of, 147, 178.

San Juan de Ullua, dungeons of, 280.

Saracens in Spain, the, development of, 116, 240, 287; civilisation of, 289.

Saxons, the, occupation of Britain by, 9, 17; rule in Britain of, 18, 21; conquest of, in Germany, by Charlemagne, 117.

Scandinavia, history of, 228; departure of the pirate chiefs from, 229; depredations by the pirate chiefs of, 229; the Varangians of, in Russia and Byzantium, 230.

Selim I., conquest of Syria and Egypt by, 259.

Selim II., conquest of Cyprus by, 259; fleet of, destroyed, 259.

Sempach, battle of, 239.

Seven Years' War, 133, 206.

Siam, 271.

Siam, wars of, with Pegu, 271; French plot to found a Gallic empire in, 271; expulsion of the French from, 271; change of royal dynasty in, 271; intercourse of, with the British in India, 271; government of, 271.

Slave-trade, the, abolition of, 32, 82, 96.

Slavs, the 9; in Russia, 187.

Smaller Spanish Republics, the, 283.

Solferino, battle of, 255.

Solyman, the Magnificent, defeats of the Hungarians and Germans by, 259; conquests of, 259.

Spain, 246.

Spain, early history of, 240; invasion and conquest of, by the Moors, 240; rule of the Moors in, 241; formation of the Christian kingdoms in, 241; wars between the Christians and Moors in, 241; conquest of the Moors in, by Ferdinand, 242; establishment of the Inquisition in, 242; expulsion of the Moriscoes from, 243; decline of, 243; occupation of, by Napoleon I., and elevation of Joseph to the throne, 140, 244; active interference of the British in, 140, 244; expulsion of the French from, 140, 244; subsequent history of, 244; Carlist movement in, 244; present condition of, 245; literary celebrities of, 245.

Spanish Dominions in America, enumeration of, 278.

Spanish Succession, war of the, 243.

Spires, Diet of, condemnation of the Reformation by, 170.

St. Bartholomew, massacre of, 127.

St. James on the Birs, battle of, 239.

Sviatoslaf of Russia, rejection of Christianity by, 190; creation of private appanages in the time of, 190.

Sweden, formation of a regular government in, 229; introduction of Christianity into, 230; extinction of the race of Odin in, 230; amalgamation of, with Norway and Denmark, 230; secession of, from the union, 230; introduction of the Protestant religion in, 230; era of Gustavus Adolphus in, 230; position acquired in Europe by, 231; wars of Charles XII., king of, and their results, 231; selection of Bernadotte as king of, 231; annexation of Norway to, 231; present condition of, 231; literary celebrities of, 232.

Switzerland, 237.

Switzerland, situation of, 237; early history of, 237; division of, into petty baronies, 237; forest cities of, 238; connection of, with Austria, 238; rebellion and independence of, 167, 238; wars of, with Charles the Bold, 238; further wars of, with Austria, 239; subsequent development of, 239; occupation of, by the French, 239; subversion of the constitution of, 239; annexation of, to France, 239; independence regained by, 239; present condition of, 239.

TÁRTÁRS, the, conquest of Russia by, 194.

Tell, William, story of, 167.

Thirty Years' War, 171, 231.

Tilsit, treaty of, 209.

Trafalgar, battle of, 31.

Troyes, treaty of, 122.

Turkey, 256.

Turkey, called after the Turks, 256; foundation of, in Lesser Asia, by Othmán, 257; foundation of, in Europe, by the reduction of Adrianople, 258; Constantinople captured, and made the capital of, 259; annexation of Syria and Egypt to, 259; other annexations to, 259; decline of, 260; war of, with Peter the Great, 260; repetition of wars with Russia, 260; war of Greek Independence with, 260; defection of Egypt from, 261; war of, with Russia in 1854, 261; present condition of, 261.

Turks, the, origin of, 256; settlement of, in Turkestan, 256; employment of, under the Arabs, 256; independent settlements of, 257; foundation of the Ottoman power by, 257.

UNITED PROVINCES, the, formation of, 235; independence of, 235; disputes of, with England, 236; wars of, with Louis XIV., 236; annexation of, with France, 236; subsequent changes in, 236.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE, 85.

United States, the, organisation of, 92; heterogeneous character of the people of, 92, 93; no proper name acquired by the people of, 93; peace of, with England after the revolutionary war, 93; second war of, with England, 93; rapid improvements effected in, 94; mania of, for increase of territory, 94; present extent of, 95; treatment of the native races by, 96; slavery in, 96; civil war in, 97; liberation of slaves in, 98, 99; position of parties in the civil war, 98; vitality of the Southern States established, 98; effect of the liberation of slaves in, 99; present position of, 100; system of government in, 101; character of the legislature of, 102; crudities of the constitution of, 102; forms of administration in, 103; civilisation in, 104; shortcomings of the people of, 105; intellect of the people of, 107; character for combination of the people of, 108; redeeming traits in the character of the people of, 108; natural associations of the people of, 109; antipathy of, against Britain,

110, 111; real position of, 110; mission of, as distinguished from that of Britain, 110; destiny of, 111; bee in the bonnet of, 112.

VARANGIANS, the, spread of, into Russia, 9, 230.

Vehme Gerichte, or secret tribunals of Germany, 164.

Verneuil, battle of, 25.

Victoria, reign of, 33.

Vladimir the Great, of Russia, infamous character of, 190; conversion to Christianity of, 191; establishment of Christianity in Russia by, 191.

WAGRAM, battle of, 140.

Waterloo, battle of, 31, 142; succeeded by the longest peace, 32.

Western Empire, the, restoration of, 287, 289; civilisation borrowed from the Moors by, 290.

Westphalia, peace of, 172.

William III. of England, reorganisation of the fleet by, 44.

William IV. of England, reign of, 33.

Wittenagemot, the, constitution of, 21; difference of, from the *Fuhring brat* of the Britons, and the *Concilium* of the Normans, 22.

YAROSLAF of Russia, dissemination of civilisation by, 191; translation of the Bible into Slavonian by, 191; codification of the laws by, 191; greatness of, 192; connections of, 192.

THE END.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS ON PREVIOUS EDITIONS.

"Mr. J. A. G. Barton,¹ who published, a year ago, a compendium of ancient history, under the title of 'The Ancient World,' has followed it up with a survey of modern history on the same plan, entitled 'The Modern World.' Into a crown octavo volume of three hundred pages, which may easily be carried in the coat pocket, Mr. Barton contrives to compress a very intelligent outline of the history of Great Britain, her dependencies, the United States, France, Germany, and Russia, with briefer notices of the other modern States which have acquired some importance in the world. He carries readers with him to a point whence the whole course of modern history is brought clearly within the field of vision. . . . On the whole, Mr. Barton is a trustworthy guide: his reading has been wide, and his narrative, though exhibiting a vehemently patriotic spirit, is generally accurate. His book is excellently adapted to be used in the higher classes of schools. We know no other elementary compendium of modern history which can at all compare with it."—*The Scotsman*, 11th February, 1876.

"Mr. Barton, whose very excellent compendium on the 'Ancient World' we had occasion to commend, has given us a companion-volume on the 'Modern World.' He discriminates, with much acumen and justice, the characteristics of the different nations. Great Britain and her dependencies very justly have the foremost place; the United States follow, then France, Germany, Russia, and the other States of Europe. A chapter suffices for the other independent States of the globe. For a brief summary of history, and a well-proportioned view of the national forces of the modern world, we can highly commend Mr. Barton's little work."—*British Quarterly Review*, for July, 1876.

"Mr. Barton's 'Modern World,' a companion to his 'Ancient World,' of which we spoke favourably some time back, is an interesting treatise on the history of all the modern nations. It is not a school book, for it omits all those details which fasten on a young learner's mind. It is rather a book which endeavours to show the advanced student the relative value of what he has learned."—*Westminster Review*, for October, 1876.

¹ Like the "Ancient World," the "Modern World" also, was originally published under the *nom de plume* of J. A. G. Barton.

"The 'Modern World.'—This seems to be published as a companion to the 'Ancient World,' by the same author. It is a good digest of the historic facts and the present conditions of the nations of the world, giving the turning-points or salient incidents without any appearance of entanglement. . . . Mr. Barton's accuracy is another excellent point in his writing. . . . These brief notes show the truthful character and great excellence of Mr. Barton's writings as an historian. . . . We must add that there is a clever *résumé* at the end of the book, very comprehensive and lucid in character. Whoever wants to read facts of history placed in true focus, national struggles for greatness, military convulsions, the unification of power, and the consolidation of monarchies, popular struggles for freedom, and the sweeping changes which have come over human society, should peruse the 'Modern World,' by J. A. G. Barton."—*The British Mail*, 29th April, 1876.

"The 'Modern World.'—This is a truly practical book, the value of which cannot fail to be made extensively felt wherever it may obtain the circulation it claims, and well deserves."—*Bell's Weekly Messenger*, 26th February, 1876.

"The 'Modern World.'—This will prove a very serviceable book to students. Mr. Barton is already favourably known to the reading public as the author of the 'Ancient World,' and other works of sterling merit. The chapters in the 'Modern World' on 'Great Britain,' the 'United States of America,' 'France,' and 'Germany,' are especially good. Mr. Barton has certainly given us, in a moderate amount of space, quite a library-full of information, so to speak."—*The Civil Service Gazette*, 5th February, 1876.

"Mr. Barton has added, in the present volume, an appropriate companion to his 'Ancient World,' which latter work has been favourably noticed in general. The 'Modern World' aims at presenting the reader with a short, handy, and precise epitome of the political and other causes and tendencies which have wrought out the existing order of relations between the different countries and nations of the globe. As a trustworthy guide to this very necessary knowledge—which the historical studies at school do not at all suffice to impart—Mr. Barton's work may be accepted without hesitation. He writes plainly and simply. . . . The grown-up man or woman, with little time for extensive reading, will find in the 'Modern World' a succinct *résumé* of the information expected to be possessed by every intelligent member of society. . . . The Americans will not, we fancy, thank Mr. Barton for his plain speaking with regard to their country and its institutions; but most of his remarks on the United States are perfectly legitimate and correct. Altogether, one may read this little volume with

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS ON PREVIOUS EDITIONS.

profit, and certainly with pleasure as well."—*The Edinburgh Courant*, 11th February, 1876.

"‘Modern World.’—Mr. Barton, in his new effort, is certain to add to his reputation. All the features which commend his former works are here apparent, with at least equal emphasis. So well has he selected his historical facts that one scarcely feels he is reading an epitome of general history. Mr. Barton is by no means opinionative, but he *has* opinions. . . . This is well put, and we might quote largely to show that Mr. Barton generally *puts it* well. . . . This is writing that commends itself, and, therefore, to teachers of our youths, who teach history for its own sake, with no proclivities, Liberal or Conservative, we strongly recommend it."—*The Glasgow Herald*, 3rd July, 1876.

"Mr. Barton having sketched the history of the ancient world, now appropriately extends his task by writing in a similar style of rapid narrative the story of modern times. Within the compass of a small pocket-volume we are carried from shore to shore of the known world, and the people shown to us under their varying conditions with general accuracy and singular comprehensiveness. So much of the world's history could hardly be given with more accurate brevity and with the same really graphic distinctness. The narrative is too rapid to be involved, and the abundant material gives volume to its easy flow. Objections may be taken to the tone in parts—notably to the contemptuous delineations of certain well-known American characteristics; but against this we may place the good sense of the author in dealing with our Indian interests and the policy of Russia—good sense which we gladly recommend as an antidote to alarmist ‘Shadows of Coming Events.’ On the whole the book is sound and masterly."—*The Liverpool Weekly Albion*, 4th March, 1876.

"Mr. Barton, who has previously placed the public under obligations by his excellent compendium of history entitled ‘The Ancient World,’ has in the present volume supplied a comprehensive survey of existing national powers, pointing out the memorable events which have contributed to their present relative position, and especially tracing the progress made by political liberty through all these changes. The work, as a whole, is admirably done."—*The English Independent*, 10th February, 1876.

909/DAT



15555



8.11.58